

The
GREAT
MENACE

GEORGE
WHITEFIELD
MEAD

ifornia
onal
ty

Friendship Hill,

AKS


45

Friendship **Hill**


O.K.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation





THE GREAT MENACE



THE GREAT MENACE

AMERICANISM OR BOLSHEVISM?

BY

GEORGE WHITEFIELD MEAD



NEW YORK

DODD, MEAD AND COMPANY

1920


COPYRIGHT, 1920,
By DODD, MEAD AND COMPANY, INC.

VAIL-BALLOU COMPANY
BINGHAMTON AND NEW YORK

DEDICATED
IN GRATEFUL AFFECTION
TO
THE THREE COMPANIONS
OF MY HOME:

My wife, who inspires and makes it;
Our boys, who sometimes return
to gladden and undo it.

2137105



FOREWORD

This book has been written in the belief that it will help in an immediate nationwide campaign of publicity of the disaster facing our country in the Great Menace.

The greatest peril of America is not ultra-radicalism, but indifference to it, a listless confidence that "it can't be done." In referring to the present active policy for "the confiscation of private property, the assassination of public officers, the burning of army barracks and police stations, the over-turn of the United States Government," the *New York Times*¹ makes this pertinent comment, "How much effect does this have on the 'ordinary American citizen?' It is nonsense. 'They can't do it?' Well, there are a good many of these offensive people in the United States; and they are not conscious that they can't do it. . . . They are endowed

¹ Editorial, Nov. 11, 1919, p. 12.

for their work of massacre and ruin by wealthy half-baked Americans. . . . As solid American citizens, *innocently believing* that what has been will continue to be, . . . we are inclined to grin tolerantly at the program, the energetic, fanatical, and ferocious program, of world-revolution of Russian adopters of Marxism.”

The *American Lumberman*, in calling attention to the Great Menace that imperils our country and that “many are consoling themselves with the thought that the good sense of the average citizen will prevail and that this danger will pass without any effort on our part,” declares that “THESE CITIZENS NEED TO BE AWAKENED FROM THIS SORT OF LETHARGY,” AND SHOCKED “OUT OF ANY FALSE SENSE OF SECURITY.”²

Hundreds of American newspapers and magazines could be quoted, citing facts which show that “outside of Russia the storm-centre of Bolshevism is in the United States,”³ and that Americans must “awaken to the danger,” and overthrow it or be overthrown by it.

² Issue of Oct. 18, 1919.

³ *Literary Digest*, Nov. 8, 1919, p. 15.

FOREWORD

ix

When the American people are truly aware of the extent of the work of the Great Menace and of its real intent, they will most surely do what needs to be done, thoroughly and without delay. The immediate need, therefore, is publicity: to make *the facts* known, and to make known also certain things which the new age decrees must be done for the preservation of democracy and our home country with its sacred institutions. To that work this book is given.


GEORGE WHITEFIELD MEAD.

January, 1920.




CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
FOREWORD	vii
I THE GREAT MENACE	1
II THE RELATION OF THE PEOPLE, LABOR, AND CAPITAL IN THE IMPENDING REVOLUTION	48
III CONDITIONS FAVORING BOLSHEVISM THAT DO NOT RIGHT THEMSELVES; AND REA- SONS FOR FAITH IN THE PEOPLE . . .	67
IV THE NEW PATRIOTISM	101
V VITAL MESSAGES OF RELIGION FOR TO-DAY .	129
APPENDIX	
A CITIZEN'S WORKING CREED	155



THE GREAT MENACE



THE GREAT MENACE

I

THE GREAT MENACE

DURING the war our country was united by a common task and a common danger. Now that the war is over, a thousand problems have arisen, diverting attention. The way of readjustment to peace conditions is strewn with the debris of war. The great effort that is being made to clinch the momentous moral gains effected is facing abnormalities and perplexities.

The "new age" is one of unrest and uncertainties. The air is electric with change. Human society is in the throes of gropings and assertions, which are particularly noticeable with "capital" and "labor." However, their interests are not inimical. Controlled by reason and conscience, they will find a way out for conserving their common good and the in-

violable rights of society. The danger of to-day lies deeper than their differences. What is the Great Menace?

The Great Menace is a subtle determined movement for the complete overthrow of the present social order and its sacred institutions, including the Church, and for the creation of an "industrial republic" through the "conquest of the state and the powers of government." The *class* aiming to bring this to pass and put themselves at the top, whose motive is not justice, but *to rule*, now lifts its hand not alone against capital but against *every-one who is not of the industrial labor class*. Their aim is to confiscate all property, all lands, level all classes (not by lifting up but by pulling down), and to subordinate all classes, including the agricultural-labor class, to their own régime.

The Great Menace in the United States appears under different names and in different forms, often in masquerade. Sometimes it works openly; again, by stealth worms its way into groups and organizations of men for the winning of

converts and subversion of the group or organization to the socialistic-bolshevist program.

The Great Menace is popularly typified by the names of socialism, sovietism, syndicalism, communism, and bolshevism. Sometimes the *ism* is presented in ostensible popular lectures from Lyceum platforms and popular assemblies, with veiled attempt to sow seed of dissension and indoctrinate an unsuspecting people. The extent of that sort of propaganda is astoundingly large, eluding measure.

The Great Menace is now making effort, through taking advantage of trying conditions incident to the close of a great war, to sow the seed of unrest and effect radical revolutionary changes; in other words, to effect conditions in America similar to those that prevail under Bolshevik rule in Russia. I have chosen the words of this statement with care, and shall cite facts which bear their own amazing disclosure of the Great Menace in America.

The Bolshevik government in Russia has accomplished this: the confiscation of

property and the socialization of society, including the overthrow of sacred institutions and the invasion of the sanctity of the family. Divorce is granted for the mere registering of intent of separation, with no limit on the number of times that one can be married and divorced.

Have the people of Russia benefitted under sovietism? The radicals declared that the socialization of industry and nationalization of natural resources would, through giving a personal interest in things produced, bring to pass a type of efficiency impossible under the old order, resulting in increased output and adding to the sum of national wealth, and that this larger prosperity would benefit all the people and particularly improve the condition of those who are engaged in productive pursuits. Such gains, socialists have declared, would accrue to any nation under the socialistic program.

The trial given to socialization in Europe, however, has resulted in the opposite of things promised. Such is the recent testimony of Mr. Herbert Hoover, who had opportunity to personally study the

working and economic effect of radical forces in Russia, in Hungary, and in Germany,—the effect being “fatal to the hopes of sincere Socialists.” The socialization régime has resulted in appalling loss of production; and in Hungary and Russia, where the plan has had full sway, has reduced both countries to a starvation basis. Russia under the monarchy was able to produce and export more surplus food-stuffs than the United States, but now after approximately two years under the socialization system is in a state of economic collapse. Two-thirds of the railways and three-fourths of the rolling stock are out of operation. “The population is without normal comforts and is plunged into the most grievous famine of centuries. Its people are dying at the rate of hundreds of thousands monthly from starvation and disease. Its capital city has diminished in population from 2,000,000 to less than 600,000. The streets of every city and village have run with the blood of executions.” Continuing, Mr. Hoover said, “My conclusion is that socialism, as a philosophy of human application, has al-

6 THE GREAT MENACE

ready bankrupted itself. It has proved itself, with rivers of blood and suffering, to be an economic and spiritual fallacy. I believe it was necessary for the world to have this demonstration. But it is not necessary that we of the United States, now that we have witnessed these results, plunge our own population into these miseries and into a laboratory for experiment in foreign social diseases.”¹

The hostility of the Bolshevik government to the Christian religion is summarized by the following excerpts from the report of the United States Senate Judiciary Committee on Bolshevism:

“It has confiscated all church property, real and personal.

“It has established the right of anti-religious propaganda as a constitutionally recognized institution.

“It has suppress Sunday-schools and has expressly forbidden the teaching of all religious doctrines in public, either in schools or in educational institutions of any kind.

¹ Address to American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers in New York, Sept. 16, 1919.

“It prohibits religion from being taught or studied except in private.

“It has abolished all recognition of a supreme being in governmental and judicial oaths.

“It has disfranchised expressly all clergy and servants and employees of church bodies and has deprived them of all right to hold public positions.

“Under the old imperialistic régime—sinner that it was—it became the practice by both custom and decree that every newspaper and every periodical published on Easter Sunday throughout the Russian Empire carried the commemorative head-line, ‘Christ is Risen.’ On Easter Sunday of 1918 the Bolshevik publications substituted the legend:

“ ‘One hundred years ago to-day Karl Marx was born.’ ”

Must we not conclude, with the Senate Judiciary Committee, that “Bolshevism and the Christian religion cannot both survive”?

An examination of the Committee’s report, says the Minneapolis *Tribune*, will convince the American Christian that;

“Russian Bolshevism triumphant in this country would be followed by the confiscation of 203,432 church edifices; by the suppression of all denominational Sunday-schools, seminaries, and colleges; and by atheist dictatorship domination over 41,926,854 church members.”

Such is the sweep of the socialistic-bolshevist program. Do we want it in America? That very program we will have, and have *soon*, if we close our ears to the knocking at the gate. The Great Menace must be met. The crisis promises to strain our country's strongest institutions, to test our faith, and to try the heroism of bravest and noblest souls.

Is the present order of society to be superseded by one of *class* rule? Are religious institutions to cease to be? Must their work suffer eclipse?

Nothing is easier than to dismiss such questions with a shrug of the shoulder. That is possible; it is also possible “to live in a fool's paradise,”—that too *when the world is on fire*. Surely, the way to overcome dangers is not to close our eyes to them, but to face them in their full

strength, and try to remedy what is wrong.

What attitude will the Church take toward the Great Menace? I do not believe it the function of the Church to preach economics or to mix politics and religion. But, surely, no one will deny that the Church must have to do with the relation of religion to society; that its work is *to save the world*, not mere-individuals out of the world.

Kaleidoscopic changes have been faced by the great denominational bodies that have sought to adapt their work to the needs of the post-war times and in harmony with the new sentiment, assuming ministries of amazing magnitude for the succor of a suffering world. Now all loyal Americans must face conditions as they are. We cannot turn back. We must go forward, or go under.

We appreciate the momentous words of Clemenceau, spoken a few days after the Armistice was signed to a group of French senators. "Gentlemen," said Clemenceau, "our difficult time is just approaching. It is harder to win peace than to win war."

10 THE GREAT MENACE

We share the vision of Milton:

“Peace hath her victories
No less renowned than war; new foes arise,
Threatening to bind our souls with secular chains.”

In the Great Menace we have to do with subtle, hidden forces and powers. It is a challenge to the continuance of every sacred institution.

As we trace the evidences of the Great Menace in America, let us keep in mind that its purpose is the confiscation of property, the socialization of society, and the subjugation of agricultural and *all other* classes to a group of the industrial class; and that its avowed step for accomplishing such end is to do away with all public teaching or study of religion.

From the National Socialist party, through their convention in Chicago, September, 1919, comes definite word as to its spirit and purpose. It declared the party in full harmony with the revolutionary working class parties of all countries and stands by the principles stated by the third international program adopted at Moscow, Russia. Other planks in the platform read:

“We fully recognize the crying need for an immediate change in the social system. The time for parleying and compromise has passed and now it is only a question whether the full power remains in the hands of the capitalist or the working class.

“The Communist Labor party of America has as its ultimate aim the overthrow of the present system of production, in which the working class is mercilessly exploited, and the creation of an industrial republic, wherein the machinery of production shall be socialized so as to guarantee to the workers the full social value of their toil.

“To this end we ask the workers to unite with the Communist Labor party of America industrially and politically in the struggle for the conquest of the state and the powers of government in the establishment of a coöperative commonwealth.”

A more radical program, which with other incendiary literature was recently seized by our Department of Justice, is the manifesto of the Federation of Unions of

Russian Workers of the United States and Canada, which Attorney General Garvan characterizes as "the most dangerous piece of propaganda ever disseminated by any organization in the United States." Some of the things advocated are:

Capture of all products and means of production. Liberation of all political prisoners. The blowing up of all barracks. The murder of law-enforcing officials. The burning of public records. Destruction of fences and all property lines. The destruction of all instruments of indebtedness.

An accompanying plan that has been uncovered is the inciting of United States sailors to mutiny, the placing of officers in irons, and the delivery of ships to the Soviet government of Russia.

The work of the Great Menace is far outside the bounds of such methods, and in sinister ways. The daring and subtle strategy of the exponents of a "socialistic order" is illustrated by their cloaked attempt within the councils of the recent Atlantic City convention of the American Federation of Labor. Colonel Theodore W. McCullough, an eminent member of that or-

ganization, in a review of the proceedings of the convention, said: "The labor unions [at this convention] were sought out by propagandists, coming with the allurements of a new world into which the workers would be moved by their own volition. All that was required to establish the industrial millennium in America was for the men and women in the workshops and factories, mines and mills, offices and elsewhere, to follow the example of the workers of Russia and be free. . . . Bolshevism was presented in many guises, in the resolutions submitted, ranging from a proposal embodying the 'one big union' idea to another that had for its object the changing of the date for Labor Day from September 1 to May 1. It was a little significant that in all these resolutions, where it was essential to name a date for future action, May 1 was chosen. When the time came to decide on the policy, an emphatic negative was registered to each of the several resolutions on which the radicals had pinned their hopes. . . . So, if the labor unions of the United States turned a deaf ear to the agitators, to the 'parlor coal dig-

gers,' the half-baked reformers in whatever guise they came, it was . . . because their common sense and deeper understanding of the problem led them to decline to take part in any movement to wreck the institutions of our government by undertaking to substitute any sort of experiment for the true democracy under which they exist." ¹

It is fortunate for our country that the Atlantic City convention of the American Federation of Labor had delegates in majority who could not be tricked, who could recognize effort "to foment revolution," and who were determined that "organized labor of America shall go on along its evolutionary course." But in the short time since that convention, large bodies of labor, ignoring the counsel of their own leaders, have caused serious industrial troubles.

That the socialist-bolshevist advocates adroitly planned and worked with energy *within* the Atlantic City convention of the American Federation of Labor, representing more than three millions of Ameri-

¹ *New Era Magazine*, September, 1919, pp. 498 ff.

can citizens, and that similar propagandists have with the zeal of religious mania carried their teaching into other organizations and into every possible nook and corner of our land, evinces that, however mistaken their philosophy, it is an organization of determination and subtle methods that to ignore would be fatal.

Mr. W. E. Robinson, in a recent communication to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, tersely presented his judgment of this revolutionary social force as follows: "I want to say with all frankness that unless you take immediate steps to curb this socialistic tendency which is now becoming so bold, I would not be surprised if this country, in the near future, were attacked just as Russia was attacked. Remember, these men who are Bolshevists are not all of the ignorant class; many of them, indeed, are rather able men, but their aim is Socialism. They believe that no one man should have more than another; that all should fare alike; and in order to do this, it will be necessary to upset our Government, overthrow our institutions, destroy our great manufacturing interests,

confiscate lands, and permit the Bolsheviks to go rampant.”

Those are not the words of an alarmist, but of a sane and discerning man of affairs, who is able to measure tendencies and movements, and who has the good of humankind in thought and heart. And facts, appalling facts, bear out the correctness of his judgment.

As emphatic a warning comes from a spokesman of the “laboring classes,” Mr. John H. Ferguson, President of the Baltimore Federation of Labor, which has about 40,000 members. In a recent address¹ on the industrial and economic situation America is facing, Mr. Ferguson referred to the newcomers of America, “blinded by the glare of liberty,” daring to aspire, although blinded, “to force their guidance upon Americans who for generations have walked in the light of liberty.” Mr. Ferguson then spoke a warning that ought to awaken the most apathetic: “When you once leave the level road of Americanism to set foot upon the incline of socialism, it is no longer in your power

¹ August 31, 1919.

to determine where you will stop. . . . If you tolerate grave infringement upon any of these elements [of the established order of civilization] all history shows that you will have laid open to assault the foundations of personal liberty, of orderly processes of Government, of justice and tolerance, as well as the institution of marriage, the sanctity of the home and the principles and practices of religion.

“I have said all this,” continued this spokesman for labor, “because I know and you know that fomenters of unrest are abroad in the land. The tragedy which threatens to overwhelm this nation proceeds in regular fashion. Gradually, but definitely, is unfolded the plot to bring misery upon the people in the expectation that misery may advance revolution and exalt the demagogues who would become autocrats. There has been the battle of phrases, the avalanche of promises and the sapping of moral fiber. To-day there is the game of tactics between the revolutionists, who desire to control the American labor movement, and the conservatives, who would save it. To-morrow one may

confidently anticipate the outbreak. Circumstances follow each other with the regularity, though not the harmony, of a musical cadence. There has been preparation, now there is percussion, and to-morrow there will be revolution, and revolution that may involve dissolution of the United States."

Many parts of our country have recently witnessed disturbances that had all the symptoms of the Great Menace: strikes without notice and without instruction or counsel with labor leaders; bomb throwing on May Day and June 2, 1919; attempts to hold radical demonstrations; and the appearing of a "miners' army." When the miners' army spontaneously organized in West Virginia, Governor Cornwell said that mysterious radical influence had been working in that part of the State. Added to this, is the crime of the I. W. W. in deliberately shooting and killing, from their Headquarters in Centralia, Washington, four American soldiers in uniform, veterans of the World War, when in an Armistice Day parade.

The great Northwest has been a center

of virulent radicalism. In Idaho can be seen miles upon miles of blackened area, where forest fires destroyed more than 2,000,000 feet of magnificent timber, valued at approximately \$6,000,000,—timber sorely needed for the building of homes, farm out-buildings, and manufacturing. For this wanton destruction, the “direct action” preaching of the Industrial Workers of the World is held responsible. Within the past year thirty-two lumber camps, with their surrounding stands of timber, have suffered the same fate due to the same causes. That is the kind of sabotage the Industrial Workers of the World agitator preaches as a means of attaining his ends. “The forests in Northern Idaho were fired because the lumberjacks were not satisfied with what they were getting and so gave ear to the apostles of ‘direct action.’” To counteract this the big lumber companies tried a new experiment. They let out the cutting of timber to small groups of lumberjacks, calling themselves ‘jippos,’ or small contractors, three men working in a team, and agreed to pay them so much a thousand feet of timber they

cut. In this way the lumber jacks have been able to make individually from \$10 to \$25 a day, and yet they are not altogether satisfied. There is a complaint that the hours are too long.”¹

In view of the shortage and high cost of timber and coal, possibly the public can learn to do without houses and to keep warm by fireless cookers.

Shortly after the race riots in Washington and Chicago belief was expressed in the House of Representatives that the I. W. W. were using propaganda to inflame the negroes. That belief is now confirmed by incendiary propaganda in the hands of the Department of Justice. Referring to the seized literature which had been spread to inflame the negroes, Ralph Bevin Smith made this comment: “ If the I. W. W., the American Federated Commune Soviets and similar radical organizations have their way the end lies in the Bolshevizing of the American negro. Taking advantage of every atrocity ascribed to black or white, of every outbreak of race hatred, the Bolshevik in this country is doing his

¹ S. M. Reynolds, Spokane, Wash., Staff Correspondent, *Baltimore Sun*, September 14, 1919.

utmost by word of mouth and by written propaganda to obtain control of the negro workingman and to incite him to join with the outlaws among white workers to plunge the United States in the throes of a disastrous social revolution. If Bolshevism succeeds in making a tool of the American negro workingman a new issue will be injected among the complications of the nation's problem, the peril of which cannot be exaggerated."¹

Following is an excerpt from the American Anarchist Federated Commune Soviets "to you workers of America, colored or white:" "By our united strength we, the workers of all colors and creeds, shall start the real worth-while war for the overthrow of the entire capitalist system and the taking over of all the industries, farms and warehouses of the country, whereby we will produce for ourselves, and where each one will have what he needs without having to hunt or kill one another in order to get a 'job.' If blood will have to be spilled in order to enable us to accomplish this, then let it never

¹ New York *Herald*, Oct. 12, 1919, p. 5.

again be the blood shed by worker against workers, but let it be the blood of capitalism, its government, church and press, that will attempt to prevent us, the workers, from freeing ourselves of the present slavery and our retaking of all the wealth we have produced and been robbed of. If battles must be fought, if riots must take place, if blood must be shed in order to destroy the present slavery, then let us do it and by our united strength start the real war—the social revolution.”¹

The success of inflammatory propaganda in influencing negroes is suggested by the *Messenger*, which calls itself “the only radical negro magazine in America.” The July number of the *Messenger* was excluded from the mails by the Postmaster General. Its editorials contained such statements as this: “The agencies of law and order and justice are, to the negro, agencies of lawlessness, disorder and injustice. The flag for which he fought mocks and deserts him while his life and property are taken away. The press and church are stirred more by Bolshevism in

¹ Ibid.

Russia than by anarchism and murder in Tennessee.”

During the war America was proud of the black man's loyalty. Greater is the treason that “red” agencies in our country have tried to implant rancor and hatred in the minds of negroes and incite them to violence.

Other facts evince the activity of radicals for the overthrow of governmental institutions. Report from Washington recently declared that there are thousands of aliens now in this country agitating for the confiscation of property and the overthrow of the American system of constitutional government; and that these agitators are supported by many of the 3000 newspapers published in foreign languages and circulated in the great centers of industry.¹

Attorney General Charles D. Newton in a recent statement made public that an American, Daniel De Leon, was the first to advocate the establishment of the Soviet councils which have written the recent history of Russia “in the blood of innocents.” In speaking of the New York State Legisla-

¹ See *New York Times*, Oct. 17, 1919.

tive Committee Investigating Bolshevism, Mr. Newton said, "As further proof that the Soviet plan is of American conception, I might point out that a majority of the active workers aligned with Leon Trotsky, the Bolshevik dictator of Russia, were educated in radicalism in the slums of Boston, on the east side of New York, in the slums of Chicago, and the dregs of other large American cities. Documents seized by the committee's investigators bear out this startling and lamentable fact. The New York State Legislative Committee discovered a direct connection between the Bolsheviks in Russia and the radicals in the United States. This connection was maintained by Ludwig C. A. K. Martens, 'envoy' of the Bolsheviks, who opened an office in New York which the newspapers were accustomed to style the 'Bolshevist embassy.' " ¹

In the United States Senate Oct. 13, Senator Poindexter gave warning that there is "real danger that the Government will fall" if it continues its attitude of "supine inaction" toward the radical ele-

¹ Ibid.

ments over the country. Three days later the Executive Committee of the National Security League issued a statement which said: "The time has arrived for the people of America to wake up to a realization of what is taking place. It is social evolution downward—nothing else. The radical agitation which is menacing the foundations of our industrial life is not based upon specific grievances, but is aimed at the overthrow of American institutions and ideals just as surely as if a Bolshevik army was marching on Washington. The American people are confronted with all the destructive forces of minority class rule which have made a waste of Russia. The bloody method of the Bolshevik revolution is the only condition lacking. In fact, its absence is the sole reason for the long blinding of our citizens' eyes to what is going on. Internationalism, syndicalism, communism, socialism, are the antitheses of Americanism. Americanism means the best in the ideals of the peoples of all the world, the best of human ideals—manhood. Manhood means ambition, self-denial, thrift. These ideals can

spring only from the protection of personal liberty and the right of property—the right of individual possession of property as guaranteed by the Constitution. He who does not believe this cannot be an American.”

Out of the press comments on the steel strike the *Literary Digest*¹ had this conclusion: “As many observers see it, the calling of the steel strike at this time reveals the purpose of certain revolutionary radicals to wrest control from the hands of moderate-minded leaders and place the Reds in the saddle, thus making it ‘the first gun of the industrial revolution.’ ”

Speaking at a meeting of the Institute of Arts and Sciences of Columbia University, President Nicholas Murray Butler referred to the steel strike, saying: “The history of the beginnings of the steel strike reads strangely like the beginnings of the European war. The ultimatums of Mr. Fitzpatrick and Mr. Foster might well have been written by Count Berchtold, Chancellor Bethman-Hollweg, or Minister von Jagow. The published statements of

¹ October 11, 1919, p. 11.

these gentlemen are alike in that they make no appeal whatsoever to right and justice, but simply give notice of peremptory demands and announce that when a fixed limit of time expires force will be used to support the demands. Yet few people realize that the demands and ultimatums of Mr. Foster and Mr. Fitzpatrick are just as much contrary to our political principles as those of the Ministers of the Central Powers."

Thinking is somewhat clarified by the fact that the steel and iron workers who went on strike were receiving \$8, \$18, \$22, and some as high as \$30 a day.

At the meeting of the Institute of Arts and Science of Columbia University President Butler also said: "Recently the startling doctrine has been taught and practiced that the strike may be used to enforce the views and wishes of a small minority of the population in matters relating not only to public transportation and to other public utilities, but to political and public acts of every sort. . . . It must be apparent that without complete loyalty to the democratic principle, without re-

spect for law, without sincere devotion to American ideals of government, and without good will on the part of all elements and groups of society, the economic and political life of the nation can no longer go forward, and that we are in imminent danger of national shipwreck and of incalculable disaster.”

Loyal Americans do not want to be made “tools” for the undoing of American institutions. They ought to be forewarned that they may not be misled by what they read or hear, or by misplaced sympathy. The Senate Labor Committee investigating the steel strike elicited the astounding confession from Jacob Margolis, attorney of the I. W. W. in the Pittsburg district, an admitted advocate of social revolution, of ultra-radical activities underlying the nation-wide steel strike and of the sinister purpose of the revolutionists to control the American Federation of Labor and all trade unions. Mr. Margolis declares he is “against God, government, and Church.” He “wants government to disappear.” He is for the confiscation of private property. His confession reveals that *the un-*

derlying motive of the modern strike is not for the redress of grievances but for power through creating internal troubles and unrest that will lead to revolution. These facts ought to be weighed by American citizens. And no people will welcome the facts more than the honest men of labor. The ulterior revolutionary design of modern strikes is stated by Mr. Margolis in these words: "I favor all strikes. I welcome the feeling of unrest. I believe in production organization. The Plumb Plan is a step in that direction. I want the workers to conduct the industries. I view capital as entitled to no reward."

The I. W. W., the anarchic syndicalists, the Russian Union, are all for the strike,—not for grievances, but "to cripple industry," create "the feeling of unrest," and so "help the revolutionary actions of American workers," to the end that "private property may be confiscated," "government disappear," that they may "conduct the industries," and as a class may rule.

The ultra-radical methods to create trouble and unrest may for the time create

trouble and unrest,—for labor and for others. But such trouble also defers the better day for labor as for others. America is not Russia. In Russia 80 per cent. of the people are illiterate, and they have never been trained to rule. American democracy has a history of approximately 150 years and a people in the main who are self-reliant, loyal and intelligent, and who welcome and work for industrial and social improvement, and who, therefore, will never consent to plans that would despoil society and destroy the American government and institutions.

Free speech is not license for treason. A strike for redress of grievances is one thing; a strike with underlying revolutionary intent, in a word for power, is quite another thing.

Must our Federal Government, following the laws of Australia and New Zealand, declare a strike of employees, or a lockout on the part of employers, a criminal offense and punishable, and require that every dispute be settled by compulsory arbitration? That is possible. But there is only one way to deal with the nihilist

movement and that is to crush it. This much is certain: the American people in united power stand for the maintenance of law and order and sacred American institutions.

Has the time come for inviting certain men and groups of men to leave the country? It would be better that the output of industry be crippled for the want of workers than that industry itself be crippled by the presence of those workers.

One other word of warning ought to be spoken by loyal leaders in our country,—a warning to be guarded against insidious writings and lectures. Certain respectable appearing publications and certain accredited auspices for lectures are being used by sinister propagandists, who artfully weave in teachings that make for unrest, with revolutionary design. The daring of the ultra-radicals is further confirmed by Senator Watson, who declared in the United States Senate ¹ that even the Federal service is honeycombed with all sorts of radical propaganda of the most obnoxious kind. The disclosures by

¹ October 20, 1919.

Senator Watson have caused astonishment, —particularly the alleged socialist activities of Federal Commission employees with the spread of Bolshevism, and the statement that other Government officers are “permeated with red flag socialism and anarchism.” The preamble to Senator Watson’s resolution for an investigation of the trade commission, reads in part: “If Bolshevism, with all that it implies, is to be met and overcome in this country it must be done by first ousting all its adherents and advocates from public office.”

It is amazing that the “reds” have worked their way into high places and that they often sit in the seats of the innocents. Our good fortune is that their work and presence are known at last. For long we slept, and the dragon crept upon us. Now there is just one thing to do,—and that is to place our heels upon it.

With the avowed purpose of radicalism; with the warnings and protests against the Great Menace by men of affairs and by representatives of capital and representatives of labor; with the seething unrest of to-day that unless controlled promises to

break out into flame; and in the face of the wide spread spirit of socialism under varied names and in varied forms, but with intent to confiscate property, to level all classes, to cure all social ills by killing all extant institutions, dare we stand by silent, and indolent? Is leadership to pass to unreasoning visionaries or proponents of violence in effort to establish their distorted image of free government? If so, cataclysm will sweep our country and involve the world. The leaders of both capital and labor are working to stay such calamity. Can a *loyal* American do less? When the Great Menace is known and its plot exposed, it will be opposed by the loyal of our country with all the fervor of moral passion.

The time is when *sane leaders must lead*. The urgency is a summons to all good citizens and their various organizations: associations, boards of trade, lodges, granges, women's clubs, colleges, churches. The people ought to be informed and warned. The sinister design of socialism or bolshevism is often presented with such rose-colored philosophy that many men and

women who writhe under unjust social conditions, and who, cut to the quick by seeing the worn, emaciated and despoiled victims of economic plutocracy, have turned to socialism in the hope of relief, not knowing that in so doing they were following a mirage,—as in Russia oppressed people looked to the socialist-bolshevist movement as to a savior, only to find a despot sevenfold greater than the one previously known or of which an outraged people had ever dreamed.

In our country the socialists come with sweet words and golden promises of an immediate industrial millennium. I speak whereof I know. I have attended their meetings, talked with their leaders, read their books, pamphlets and papers. Should they accomplish their designs, nothing for the time being could prevent our country from becoming another despoiled and bleeding Russia. Of course, such conditions could not continue forever, but continuing even for a time the price that would be paid in added suffering and human woe for the lesson would be appalling.

Every society and church in our country ought to make known that the socialist-bolshevist movement is a menace, not a Messiah, and so coöperate with the worthy leaders of labor and capital for the preservation of American institutions. This is a work we ought to do, and we ought to do it *now*. In doing it, let us make sure that we keep our temper as well as our loyalty.

It must be made plain that revolution has no right in a democracy. Revolution is inimical to the right of self-determination. One of the meanings of democracy is that it is a government wholly by the people. That is why we speak of the Administration; it *administers* the government of sovereign citizens, who by majority voice have sole authority to determine national policy. In Europe for the most part the right of people to govern themselves has been denied. Kings and emperors have been rulers. Therefore, revolution has been advocated, and the people have been in age long revolt against their rulers. In America we are our own rulers; therefore, there is no room for revolution.

The right of revolt does not exist. How can we revolt against ourselves? Through the hard school of experience we may change our views, may reverse our judgments, but in so doing we speak for ourselves, determine our own destiny,—which is pleasant and prosperous when our determination is right, or unpleasant and disastrous when our determination is wrong. But we are willing to pay the price of mistakes for the privilege of ruling ourselves. To a part of our people, however, particularly to those who have come to us from other countries we should make it clear that in determining any internal policy we have no right to use force or have recourse to anything but public opinion and the orderly processes of law as previously determined by majority voice of the people, of whom we are a part.

Because we are our own rulers we regard as dangerous any group of men who would usurp to themselves the prerogatives of government that belong to the people, just as we would regard as dangerous any executive who would arrogate to himself the prerogatives that belong to the people.

Rule by a group or an individual is autocracy, which is diametrically the opposite of democracy. And exactly that is the purpose of those persons who would effect social changes by recourse to revolution. The purpose is tyranny. And nothing is to be gained, save more trouble, by falsifying the fact. However, the condition is not one to be faced in dismay, but with decision and with definite steps for removing the very roots of the trouble, which can be done because it *must* be done. Dawdling must give place to doing.

The Great Menace is not the only wrong to be righted. The unfeeling employer who has exploited labor, thereby inflicting suffering that cries to heaven for judgment, and also thereby reflecting on honorable employers who are considerate and just, deserves moral execration and our demand for laws that will bring him to justice. The profiteer who combines with his competitor in making fictitious prices should similarly be dealt with. Wickedness in "high places" must be condemned, just as wickedness is condemned in other places. But the Great Menace must have

our immediate attention because it is our immediate peril.

In all this, we ought to keep clearly in mind that the movement typified by the words "organized labor" is not to be confused with the socialist movement. Radicals have sought its control by "bor-ing in" the Federation of Labor "from within," but they do not represent the majority nor the conscience of organized labor. We ought also to keep clearly in mind that men of wealth to-day have large opportunity for constructive service in establishing a just social order. Upon them is that solemn duty. Labor's rights and capital's rights are only the common rights of society. They are not to be classified and dealt with as separate from the rights of all other classes. That sort of thing will help neither labor nor capital nor society at large. Let us do everything we can to allay, not foment classism.¹ Class rule of any sort is un-democratic, un-American and unsafe, be it of capital or labor, noble or ignoble, learned or unlearned. Opposed to this the socialists-bolshevists

¹ See *New Era Magazine*, September, 1919, p. 473.

aim at class rule, by themselves. Loyal citizens will stand for true Americanism: for government of, for and by the people; for a spirit of moderation and restraint, of justice and good will to all. That noble spirit of idealism, that atmosphere of traditional Americanism, must be the soul and breath of effective work.

Since the signing of the Armistice something fine seems to have gone out of the world. Could such a war result otherwise? Many men and women who during the war worked and sacrificed and bought liberty bonds, all as one big family together, are now willing to knife one another, in a mad, deadly game of beggar-my-neighbor,—policemen leaving cities to the pillaging of the under-world, longshoremen and other workmen letting food spoil on docks and in warehouses while families suffer for want of it, miners ready to jeopardize the health and lives of little children and helpless mothers through need of fuel, and clamor widespread for more profit, wages, gain. To go on at that pace is to follow a vicious circle, one that has no end. That sort of policy will injure the country worse than did the war. Here again, must not sane

leaders lead—by example and counsel? Extravagance now is worse than bolshevism for it is creative of that very thing.

“The men who toil with their hands, who protect our persons and our property are not vicious and cruel. They are simply swept off their feet by a tide that is too heavy for most of them. . . . Suddenly made conscious of their power they forget their obligations to other members of society and insist only on what they think to be their rights. Some great new ideas must be instilled into their minds,”¹ reasons a recent writer.

Rather, must not some great *old* ideas be instilled into *all* minds—the ideas of social justice and brotherhood, for which millions of American men went to war?

The present particular task is large and urgent. To underestimate or idly contemplate the Great Menace is to let the ship of state go upon the rocks.

The Great Menace not only seeks the overthrow of government and American institutions but also the Church. It would clean it out, root and branch. Its philoso-

¹ *Congregationalist and Advance*, Sept. 4, 1919, p. 293.

phy has no room for any of the churches of to-day; all must go; our country is to be swept clean of them. This doctrine, though long held and cogently formulated (a notable exposition being that of the well-known socialist George D. Herron a few years ago), has been kept in the background of activities—until recently. With the success of the Bolshevist government in Russia in confiscating church properties and prohibiting public teaching or study of religion, the socialists of America, evidently believing conditions ripe for their full program, have made bold announcement of opposition to the public teaching or study of religion. An illustration of the intent and determination to do away with churches is a recent book of 315 pages by a present-day exponent of socialism. The author has culled history to show that the Church is the enemy of progress; that the woes of mankind are to be traced to its bigotry; that it kindled martyr fires through the centuries for the burning of saintly reformers, who dared to think; that it persecuted and imprisoned scientists who were trying to lead the world in the way of

light; that churchmen have been more zealous for the orthodoxy of tradition than for the heterodoxy of holy living.

The reason for the opposition of the socialists-bolshevists to the Church, the *gravamen* of their grievance, appears in the clearly expressed belief that the Church is "a shield to Privilege," and that the Church keeps struggling people "in subjection to the noble or wealthy." What answer? Let us face the charge.

I would evade nothing. Give us facts, though only a claw, a tooth, or a bone. It is true that things horrible have been done in the name of "religion." And things more horrible have been done in the name of "government," and of "law," and of "labor," and "progress." Yet, no sane person wants to do away with government, with laws, with labor, and with progress.

Is it fair to judge nations of to-day by their histories of even a hundred or more years ago? France of to-day cannot be judged by the times of Napoleon, nor England of to-day by the history of George III, or Henry VIII, nor Scotland of to-day by the doings of the Stewarts.

Indeed, there is a way of reading history as to make it appear that our own nation is full of mistakes, that from beginning to end we have been a lot of blunderers, trying to build a democracy but making a bungling job of it. Yet, despite mistakes, progress has been made, our country has advanced, and so largely advanced that America has not only saved the world, but is also the hope of the world. Why, then, look only on that part of the history which records mistakes, and go harping and whining as forgetting that good is here,—so much good that millions of men and women from across the seas have come here to make America their home.

The Church too has made mistakes. But why dwell only on that side of it? Despite the worst that can be said, the Church has advanced, progress has been made, and its merciful, beneficent work has gone on, to the succor and help of millions. It has been the pioneer of civilization in America and other lands. Had the Church through its missionaries only saved the mothers of India from the superstition which led them to sacrifice infant

children in the Ganges, or only saved innocent child widows in India from being burned alive at the time of the burial of their husband, that work would have been worthy of recognition as a great and notable work. But all this is ignored by the Socialists, who are bent on the destruction of the one beneficent institution that has brought to pass such changed conditions. And they likewise ignore the work of the Church in the war, giving of its sons, giving of its healing help, giving of millions of dollars for the succor and comfort of men regardless of creed or color, supplying 3,000 chaplains and thousands of other workers who counted life not dear that they might serve the noble men who fought our war, and giving to the full of its strength that the world might be saved from the ruthless rule of mad despots.

The socialists also overlook the contributing work of the Church for an enduring world peace. They pride themselves on being opposed to war. Is any sane person not opposed to war? Was not the recent great war "a war to end war"? That cause was loyally supported by the

Church. How much did the socialists do? Was any inspirational or material aid given by them, except under constraint and protest?

Through many years, particularly the last century, the Church has been doing practical work that is making for world peace. V. Wellington Koo, the minister from the Chinese Republic, said in 1916 that nothing "has more strongly impressed Chinese minds as to the sincerity, the genuineness, the altruism of American friendship for China than the spirit of service and sacrifice so beautifully demonstrated by American missionaries." It is the spirit of service and sacrifice that prevails in the main in churches to-day. When such spirit of moral and spiritual idealism, which the Church is working to extend, prevails among nations, war will be no more, war will be impossible.

But what of the charge that the Church is the "shield and armor of predatory economic might," and keeps struggling people "in subjection to the noble or wealthy"?

Could any belief be more mistaken? Is the statement fair? Does it bespeak ac-

quaintance with the work of the Church? Are the eyes of the men who make such statement wholly closed to its manifold ministries to every possible human need and for the amelioration of social conditions? Are their ears stopped to its outcry against social injustice and wrong? tyranny and privilege? Have they not heard its ever insistent voice for higher consideration of the rights of the people? Will they not admit that the Church has inspired a mighty ethical impulse, and that no one except bolshevists would want to live in a country without it?

The Church is committed to the great constructive statesmanship of the Christ, and so is a great incomparable agency for a purified democracy, for establishing equity and justice among men.

“None are so blind as those who will not see.” Do the socialists object to the teaching of justice? We must admit that that means condemnation of an unjust wage demand and condemnation of the confiscation of property, as well as condemnation of economic plutocracy. It may not be popular, but it is necessary, to teach the

moral law: "Thou shalt not steal." And that the Church doubtless will continue to do, even as it will continue to teach of righteousness, brotherhood, mercy, and forgiveness.

Might cannot for long rule men; never can it rule the world of souls. Progress is possible only through conforming to moral law. And no group of men, classes or nations can secure permanent good for themselves through despoiling or exploiting others, or obtaining by force, fraud, or unjust law that which belongs to others. There is no short cut to Utopias or a better order of society, no enduring road over which men and nations can come save that of righteousness and justice. The more the men who walk that way, the nearer the day of our common prosperity and common happiness in living together, and in serving together humankind. To that end *the Great Menace must go.*

II

THE RELATION OF THE PEOPLE, LABOR, AND CAPITAL IN THE IMPENDING REVOLUTION

THE present industrial and political crisis directly concerns every man, woman and child in America. All that we have, all that is sacred for which our fathers spent their lives is in jeopardy. If we value our homes and our country we must face conditions from all possible view-points, courageously, calmly and with resolute action. Loyal Americans must get together. Where laboring men believe that they have grievances, we must try to see conditions from their view-point, counseling and working together with them sympathetically and harmoniously. The ranks of labor teem with men of intense patriotism and with as high idealism as our own. They have proved this again and again. Now as loyal citizens, we must all get together and pull together to expose the plottings of the ultra-radicals and to save

PEOPLE, LABOR AND CAPITAL 49

credulous laborers and ourselves from the disaster of mistaken and ruinous leadership.

Every citizen knows in a general way that the present is a period of unrest, that the country is menaced by radicalism and that continued strikes (about 300 at the present time in the United States and Canada) are resulting in wage losses of hundreds of millions of dollars and in losses to industries of hundreds of millions of dollars,—thereby adding to the high cost of living.¹ All this is known. Is it as clearly known that all this is mainly a result of a comprehensive, pre-conceived and carefully laid plan? Do the patriotic men of labor know of the effort to make them a *tool* to promote unrest, and to effect industrial and political revolution? Do they know that the hardships as a result of strikes fall heavily on innocent people and heaviest on poor mothers and children who are least able to bear them? Do they

¹ In the recent Longshoremen's strike in New York the wage losses to longshoremen have been estimated at \$8,000,000. Wage and salary losses of clerks, teamsters and others made idle by the tie-up are figured at \$4,000,000. Steamship interests suffered a loss estimated at about \$35,000,000. The wage losses to miners in the recent coal strike are estimated at \$50,000,000.

know that that suffering is part of the plot and plan of the radical-strike leaders in the hope that the sufferings will result in uprising for the overthrow of the government and the confiscation of lands and industries? Such continued unrest and strikes will but make harder any hardships of labor. Is it not time for labor in its own interests to clean house? In times past, organized labor for the most part was a bulwark against any un-American movement or propaganda. Now the ultra-radicals, by their own confession, having bored their way into the American Federation of Labor, are seeking to revolutionize that body from within, with radical direction and control. That is the crisis of labor. Labor's rights are imperiled from within. If labor hopes to retain the popular sympathy which it has enjoyed, its stand must be unequivocal for law and order and the country's welfare. If organized labor cannot be purged of the radicalism which advocates "direct action," "sabotage" and "revolution," it will ultimately be split in twain.

Even now the ultra-agitators boast that

they control more than 30 per cent of all organized labor in the country. The pathetic and astounding part of such leadership is that thousands upon thousands of men who are following it do not know that it is wrong, do not know that they are being *used*, do not suspect the sinister purposes of their leaders. Who are some of their leaders? Jacob Margolis, an assistant in organizing the Steel Strike, who by his own confession is against "God, government and Church." Another leader is William N. Foster, Secretary of the National Committee that organized the Steel Strike. In 1912, a 47-page pamphlet on syndicalism was published by him and L. C. Ford, from which are the following condensed excerpts:

"The syndicalist knows that capitalism is organized robbery and he consistently considers and treats capitalists as thieves plying their trade. He knows they have no more 'right' to the wealth they have amassed than a burglar has to his loot, and the idea of expropriating them without remuneration seems as natural to him as for the footpad's vic-

tim to take back his stolen property without paying the footpad for it. From long experience, he has learned that the so-called legal and inalienable 'rights' of man are but pretenses with which to deceive working men; that in reality 'rights' are only enjoyed by those capable of enforcing them. He knows that in modern society, as in all ages, might is right, and that the capitalists hold the industries they have stolen and daily perpetrate the robbery of the wages system simply because they have the economic power to do so. He has fathomed the current system of ethics and morals and knows them to be just so many auxiliaries to the capitalist class. Consequently, he has cast them aside and has placed his relations with the capitalists upon a basis of naked power. In his choice of weapons to fight his capitalist enemies, the syndicalist is no more careful to select those that are 'fair' 'just' or 'civilized' than is a householder attacked in the night by a burglar. He proposes to bring about the revolution by the general strike. By the term 'gen-

eral strike,' used in a revolutionary sense, is meant the period of more or less general cessation of labor by the workers, during which period, the workers, by disorganizing the mechanism of capitalist society, will expose its weakness and their own strength; whereupon, perceiving themselves possessed of the power to do so, they will seize control of the social means of production and proceed to operate them in their own interest instead of in the interest of a handful of parasites, as heretofore. The general strike is the first stage of the revolution proper." [From page 9.]

"The wealthy capitalists themselves will also need generous guards. Syndicalists in every country are already actively preparing this disorganization of the armed forces by carrying on a double educational campaign among the workers. On the one hand they are destroying their illusions about the sacredness of capitalist property and encouraging them to seize this property wherever they have the opportunity. On the

other, they are teaching working class soldiers not to shoot their brothers and sisters who are in revolt, but, if need be, to shoot their own officers and to desert the army when the crucial moment arrives. This double propaganda of contempt for capitalist property 'rights' and anti-militarism, are inseparable from the propagation of the general strike." [Page 11.]

"Another favorite objection of ultra legal and peaceful socialists is that the general strike would cause bloodshed. This is probably true, as every great strike is accompanied by violence. Every forward pace humanity has taken has been gained at the cost of untold suffering and loss of life, and the accomplishment of the revolution will probably be no exception. But the prospect of bloodshed does not frighten the syndicalist worker as it does the parlor socialist. He is too much accustomed to risking himself in the murderous industries and on the hellish battlefields in the niggardly service of his masters to set much value on his life. He will gladly

risk it once, if necessary, in his own behalf. He has no sentimental regard for what may happen to his enemies during the general strike. He leaves them to worry over that detail." [Page 13.]

"Next to the partial strike, the most effective weapon used by syndicalists in their daily warfare on capitalism is sabotage. Sabotage is a very general term. It is used to describe all those tactics, save the boycott and the strike proper, which are used by workers to wring concessions from their employers by inflicting losses on them through the stopping or slowing down of industry, turning out of poor product, etc. The most widely known form of sabotage is that known as putting the machinery on strike thus temporarily disabling it. If he is a railroader he cuts wires, puts cement in switches, signals, etc., runs locomotives into turntable pits, and tries in every possible way temporarily to disorganize the delicately adjusted railroad system. If he is a machinist or factory worker, and hasn't ready access to the machinery he will hire out as a scab and

surreptitiously put emery dust in the bearings of the machinery or otherwise disable it. Oftentimes he takes time by the forelock, and when going on strikes 'puts the machinery on strike' with him by hiding, stealing or destroying some small indispensable machine part which is difficult to replace. Sabotage is peculiarly a weapon of the rebel minority. Its successful application, unlike the strike, does not require the coöperation of all the workers interested. A few rebels can, undetected, sabot and demoralize an industry and force the weak or timid majority to share in its benefits. The syndicalists are not concerned that the methods of sabotage may be 'underhanded' or 'unmanly.' They are very successful and that is all they ask of them." [Pages 15, 17.]

"The syndicalist takes no cognizance of society. He is interested only in the welfare of the working class and consistently defends it. He leaves the rag-tag mass of parasites that make up the non-working class part of society to look after their own interests. It is im-

material to him what becomes of them so long as the working class advances. The syndicalist is strictly an antistatist. He considers the State a meddling capitalist institution. He is a radical opponent of 'law and order,' as he knows that for his unions to be 'legal' in their tactics would be for them to become impotent." [Page 28.]

Such are the utterances of the Secretary of the National Committee that organized the Steel Strike! Such is the outspoken movement that is under way in our country,—at once wrong in its premises, reasoning and conclusions. But we must never lose sight of the fact that many of its followers do not know that it is wrong. They must be disillusioned. That is the task of loyal men of labor; that now is their peculiar responsibility. That also is the task of all loyal Americans.

Mr. Foster's partial disavowal (when under fire as a witness before the Senate Committee authorized to investigate the Steel Strike) of his former syndicalist doctrines will be accepted in the light of his previous utterances in his brochure on syn-

dicalism "that the syndicalists are not concerned that methods may be underhanded or unmanly."

The time was when strikes were an instrument for the redress of grievances; recently, under ultra-radical leaders they have been perverted to a weapon of highwaymen, and collective bargaining to collective threatening. From such leadership, organized labor ought for its own sake to clear its skirts.

For protection of people and labor certain legal restraint and control is exercised over organized capital. Why should not certain legal restraint and control be exercised over organized labor? More effective than strikes would be labor's right of appeal to a legalized Board of Investigation and Recommendation. Publicity and punishment of tyrannous and unprincipled employers would soon correct the wrongs of employees,—whose recourse to appeal rather than to a strike would not work injustice to the remaining teeming millions of their fellow countrymen.

With patience and honest purpose the right and wrong of strikes will yet be de-

terminated. Just now the question is acute. It is a time when patriotic labor can be a bulwark against the madness of bolshevism, which would bring suffering to all and benefit none except the conscienceless ultra-agitators, who aspire to rule, at any cost of blood and treasure. Meantime, until the strike question is settled both labor and capital must consider the rights of the people. In the recent coal strike, the President made the terse statement from Washington that it is a crime to plan a strike to benefit half a million and injure one hundred million people. In justice and to their credit, it should be said, large numbers of the Miners' Unions were not in sympathy with that strike, though they had sore grievances. It is more and more apparent that a small percentage of workers are making trouble for their fellow workers and for our whole country.

It is probable that 3,000,000 would be a liberal estimate of the number of persons who are members of Labor Unions in the United States,¹ or about 25 per cent. of the industrial workers of the country, leaving

¹ The American Federation of Labor claims for 1918 an affiliated membership of 2,726,478.

about 75 per cent. non-union workers. (In 1910 there were 11,490,944 persons in the United States engaged in industrial pursuits,¹ exclusive of those engaged in agricultural, commercial and similar employment).

What right has a small "rebel minority" (to use the very words of the ultra-radicals) within the three million, or, to be liberal in reasoning, what right has the entire three million trade unionists to impose revolutionary changes in the social order without the consent of the remaining ninety-seven million of the population? In democracy we have long recognized that the right to govern obtains only through consent of the governed. No three million people, of whatever name or class, have right to dictate social changes or conditions to the remaining ninety-seven million of the population. Woe will surely come to any workers whose policy is not based on reason and justice. Also any men of wealth who would exploit labor, withhold the square deal, and impose suffering

¹ Lee Wolman, "Extent of Trade Unionism," *American Academy of Political and Social Science*, January, 1917, p. 120.

through larger profits than are their rightful due, are sowing to the wind and will surely reap the whirlwind. Do we not believe with Attorney General Palmer that such men "ought to be rooted out and exposed to public scorn, and, if necessary, confined in public prison"? Just such work must be done if America is to be protected from conditions that to some seemingly justify experiments of socialism and the attacks of bolshevism. The people at large cannot always stand the present high cost of living and consequent sufferings (which are exactly the conditions for which the ultra-radicals have been working). Long continued, burdensome conditions of living might make the people willing to try the alternative of the nationalization of public utilities and industries. If so, such plan would be by a people trained in democracy—not by mad bolshevists or inexperienced Russians. But all would be an experiment, entailing hardships through a period of re-adjustment. Is not the better way the insistence by citizens on all business being done in honest ways and in justice to all? Labor,

capital and the people must learn how to live on with one another. Idleness must cease. Work must continue without interruption. Highest wages can be paid, satisfying profits made, prosperity prevail, on a basis of the square deal; and industrial differences and grievances (grievances that are real, not those of the wild imaginings of the syndicalists) can be settled by conciliation, "the basis of which must be a revised attitude on the part of the employers and employees," in the judgment of Victor A. Olander, Secretary of the Illinois Federation of Labor. This can be done if both capital and labor will play fair, if both sides will allow it to be done. If they will not allow it of their own accord, they may be obliged to do it through adjudication by the people's accord, who represent probably more than 80 per cent. of the population; the remaining 20 per cent. being those of labor and capital in industrial pursuits (as distinguished from commercial, professional and agricultural pursuits).

The Chicago *Tribune* has remarked that "there are the Capitalist Groups and the

Labor Groups, and the rest of us are the Goops." The ratio, however, of the latter to the former is as four to one. But the groups and the "goops" are inter-dependent. Is not our need to get together as Americans, all? to live and let live?

To the end of getting together, the Forum should be encouraged—in clubs, associations, granges, churches. It opens the way for acquaintance, for getting each other's viewpoints, for mutual understanding and for sympathetic, patriotic coöperation against any common danger and for our common interests and country's welfare. The forum is not an experiment. It has been tried out in country, village and cities; sometimes as a community meeting; again, under the auspices of a club, society, or a group of churches, or in cities as a popular free meeting in a theater Sunday evenings, or as an afternoon folk-moot in a church. This custom of community discussion is here to stay. The benefits are large. Let us talk things out, and let some men get talked out! In any discussion, however, in the forum or elsewhere, we must discriminate between bolshevism

and the honestly aggrieved of industrialism. Their wrongs and rights cannot be crushed by being cried down as socialism or bolshevism. That sort of method is despicable, un-American, and defers just settlement on which common welfare depends. On the other hand, there is no room in democratic America for the advocates of violence and revolution, or for any propaganda other than that of appeal to orderly process.

A noted economist, Mr. Glenn Frank, in recently advocating the forum as "the parliament of the people," said:

"The average American vote is prompted in part by hereditary opinion, in part by mob psychology, and in part by selfish interest. No small part of this is due to the fact that many of us do not have an information basis for understanding.

"Government by discussion breaks down the tyranny of fixed custom; continuous public debate on public problems is the root of change and progress; community discussion breeds tolerance; it

makes for steady instead of intermittent progress.

“In fact, common counsel, public debate, community discussion, call it what you will, underlies the constructive solution of all the vexed situations that a nation faces in a time of readjustment and change.

“Opinion arising from a hurried and uncritical reading of head lines at the breakfast table or en route to the office is thin soil from which to expect constructive policies to spring. We must set up ‘The Parliament of the People.’ ”¹

The broader vision can be gained only through information, sympathetic relations, and consideration of one another's problems—instead of merely our own. With the larger vision men will see worth in one another, and that the common sense and right way to do is to pull with and not against one another. For after all, strifes and strikes are much like dog fights in flower gardens—they settle nothing but the flowers.

¹ *The Century*, July, 1919, pp. 401 ff.

The time is here when all classes of American citizens ought to say to one another, "Come, and let us reason together."

III

CONDITIONS FAVORING BOLSHEVISM THAT DO NOT RIGHT THEMSELVES; AND REASONS FOR FAITH IN THE PEOPLE

THE growth of any movement has the sanction of certain favoring conditions; otherwise growth is impossible.

Mr. C. H. Parker bears the pertinent reflection that "the I. W. W. can be profitably viewed only as a psychological by-product of the neglected childhood of industrial America."¹ Whether or not this is true, certain it is that the Great Menace is the psychological by-product of wrong somewhere; it may be wrong judgment, wrong thinking, wrong exactions in making a living, the wrong of neglect or training. Whatever the wrongs, can we clear them up? In asking the question, we are mindful of an answering echo: "Clear them up?"

The words are hurled back by the soph-

¹ *Atlantic Monthly*, November, 1917, "The I. W. W.," pp. 651 ff.

ists of the let-alone policy; the words of men who in the teeth of palpable wrongs, human miseries and appalling needs have said, "Things will right themselves."

Now, the Great Menace imperils all that is sacred: home, Church, and State. Ominous unrest is surging about our feet. Disparity of opportunity is inflaming the minds of men; and, wisely or unwisely, they are saying that vast fortunes and dire poverty are found side by side; that 90 per cent. of the wealth of the country is in the hands of 10 per cent. of the population; that two-thirds of the people of the United States are under conditions of disadvantage; that misery caused by the high cost of living is becoming intolerable; and that discontent abounds. Murmurings, criticisms, and threats are more and more heard. We cannot blind our eyes to these facts. Yet, in the face of disturbing conditions and problems incident to new social adjustments in these post-war times, the at-ease men are saying, "Wrongs will right themselves."

Strange it is that some people can never see an automobile coming until it hits

them, nor believe a house is crumbling until it has fallen on them. Such are the ones who say, "It is true there is illiteracy, but the country will outgrow it. It is true there is injustice, but men will learn better. It is true there are imperiling conditions, but time cures all things." What reply? This: time cures nothing; time confirms, establishes, intensifies. Give a thistle time and it becomes more thistle. Time cannot change a serpent into a sheep; time will strengthen the serpent life. With time, thistles and tares in the garden of human-kind choke out worthy life; the serpents of unreason and injustice work death. Wrongs do not right themselves. Passive acquiescence with wrong conditions: poverty or tyranny, profligacy or anarchy, is sheer folly and fatal.

The ever increasing (until recently) foreign-born population in our country has been viewed by many with apprehension. The suggestion of Americanization and Christianization was greeted with the cry, "America will assimilate them. Results will take care of themselves." Results have taken care of themselves! Through

letting alone our foreign-born population, we now mark our country's danger zone by their various languages. True, many have become good citizen, some have become illustrious citizens, but many more are as foreign to Americanism now as when they first touched America's shores. Where let alone, they have gone their own way or have been an easy prey to the ignorant preacher of radicalism. In American cities, groups of these people have Sunday-schools of their own, but Sunday-schools which teach that there is no God, no future life, no reward for patient well-doing; that property has no rights, labor created all, therefore, all belongs to labor. Through the let-alone policy unrest and unreason have increasingly possessed this people, and that spirit has ripened into bolshevism, precipitating delicate and dangerous conditions, and bringing our country to the verge of cataclysm. For all of which our acknowledgment is due to the learned—and possibly worldly—advocates of the let-alone policy.

At the present time there are in America about thirteen million foreign born and

thirty million not more than one generation removed from foreign nativity. As these people came to America, all practically were segregated, and have remained so, in large cities or by great industries, living within themselves, their work and limited experience. How could they sense the American spirit and ideals and the mutualism of responsibilities and benefits of democracy? These newcomers have come mainly out of poverty and intolerable economic conditions, and with a feeling often that every man's hand was against them. Many were allured to America by romantic stories of poor boys who had amassed fortunes here, others by the stories of wages such as were never dreamed of in their home countries, and possibly some came believing that bread and butter grows on trees. Certain it is that none of them knew the *spirit of America*, that our history has been one of work, of struggle, of indomitable purpose and united faith and optimism in the righteousness of contest against undeveloped nature and unsubdued foes. They did not know that all that we possess, value and admire,

all that to us is precious, represents sacrifice, faith and works, idealism and a pull-togetherness. That is the essence of Americanism. But how were our foreign-born people to know it? They could not read our language. There was seldom any one to interpret America to them in their own language, nor, let us confess, was it always interpreted to them in the terms of fair play, the square deal, considerateness and justice,—which terms they might have understood. Now, the seeds of neglect and injustice have borne their harvest.

In speaking of the new comer to America, Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, said: "A scramble for a living! Much to see, but no one to interpret it all. So thought this new American. Then the padrone came forward as a savior. Life was not to go out anyway. And, with others in like situation, possibly from his own country, equally ignorant, equally handicapped, the new American starts his life. It takes a brave and a very ambitious man to lift himself out of such an environment. Easily he becomes a victim to the shrewd, predatory padrone or

boss. He falls into debt and becomes mortgaged to ignorance and squalor for years. His ideal of America has suffered a change. 'And is this freedom?' he says to himself, as with tired back he bends to his work, without hope that the burden will be lighter to-morrow. He cannot read the signs which warn him of danger. He can not read of the opportunities which city and country offer. In his own land perhaps he had no chance to learn in his own tongue. In this new land he is too tired, too hesitant to learn this strange, difficult tongue. Is it any wonder if to this dissatisfied stranger the voice of one who speaks to him in the language of home has authority and carries far? And if this voice preaches discontent, and violent discontent, as the one sure path to better days, is it strange that he should listen? Who are the men who master this new world? Plainly the ones he knows, from whom he has suffered. Do these same men control everything; are there no sweet places of refuge? He can find no one to make him see the greater America. The whole of this continent is to him the

cramped apartment, the dirty street, and the sweatshop or the factory. To the sweep of the great land and its many beckonings his eyes are closed. And in his isolation and ignorance and disappointment there is a fruitful nesting place for all the hurtful microbes that attack society." Continuing, Secretary Lane spoke these momentous words: "This man is our charge. He needs and deserves care, solicitude, thoughtful consideration. Ignobly put—it will pay. More manfully said—it is our duty. Worthily—it is our opportunity. Economically that man is a potential asset which we should not waste. Give him a glimpse into the philosophy which underlies our struggle and he will turn into a cheerful, strong fellow worker in the making of America, as have all the rest who have preceded him. It is money in our pockets that he should be able to care for himself; that he should know our language; that his body shall be well nourished and his mind hopeful." ¹

Will we listen to the voice of an experienced observer like Secretary Lane or to

¹ See annual report of Secretary of Interior, 1918.

that of the man who says: "Wrongs will right themselves"?

Our task is not an easy one. In 1882 a change commenced in the source of immigration, rapidly growing, until now 71 per cent of our immigration comes from the Slavic and Iberic countries of Southern and Eastern Europe: Italians, Sicilians, Hungarians, Hebrews, Magyars, Bohemians, Moravians, Bulgarians, Servians, Montenegrins, Croatians, Slovenians, Dalmatians, Bosnians, Herzegovnians, Slovaks, Poles, Lithuanians, Germans, Russians. For guidance in reaching this heterogeneous people, who came as strangers to American institutions, it is helpful to keep in mind that the steel and iron manufacturers employ 58 per cent of foreign-born helpers; the slaughtering and meat-packing trades, 61 per cent; bituminous coal mining, 62 per cent; the silk and dye trade 34 per cent; glass-making enterprises, 38 per cent; woolen mills, 62 per cent; cotton factories, 69 per cent; the clothing business, 72 per cent; boot and shoe manufacturers, 27 per cent; leather tanners, 57 per cent; furniture factories, 59

per cent; glove manufacturers, 33 per cent; cigar and tobacco trades, 33 per cent; oil refiners, 67 per cent; and sugar refiners, 85 per cent.

Of the above workers 25 per cent cannot even read or write their own language. This was a ripe field at one time for demagogism, now it is the ripened field of bolshevism,—that because as a people we listened to the teaching that “time will cure,” or were indifferent—as those that are dumb—to the appeals for educational and religious work among our foreign-born people.

I am not forgetful of the effective work that is being done by many city churches and by many denominational bodies among our immigrant classes. Social settlement workers have also rendered service of incalculable good. But all this work is pitifully small as compared with the great and growing need. The fault is not with the Church, which is doing practically all that is being done in this work, but rather the fault is with those who have not responded to appeals to help Americanize our foreign-born population. In the teeth of history

and present peril, these proponents of ostrich-logic could be heard in the land, saying, "Don't talk about these things. Conditions will right themselves." So have they sown to the wind and we are reaping the whirlwind.

The time-will-cure policy has in another way put black spots all over our land, the black spots of illiteracy. Facts brought out through the draft have helped to correct the figures of the last census. The native-born illiterates outnumber the foreign-born illiterates. And the problems with drafted men have shown that illiteracy in America is a matter of national concern. Out of the first 2,000,000 drafted men 200,000 "could not read their orders or understand them, or read the letters sent them from home." These men had to be held in camp for instruction in primary education before they could be made soldiers, thus adding to the burden of our country and entailing loss of time when time was an important factor.

There are eight and a half million persons in the United States over ten years of age who cannot read English, and five and

one half millions who can read nothing, not a line in a newspaper, or from a message of the President or from the acts of Congress, nor a word of the Bible. How can such people understand America or the meaning of the momentous time in which they are living? How can they discern the sinister designs of the agents of disruption: to exploit them and to mislead them? all because of our neglect to win them to intelligent citizenship. *The bolsheviki have long had their personal workers among them, inciting discontent and preaching socialism as the panacea for social ills.*

Do we realize the vast influence and power represented by our illiterate citizenry? This people, whom the socialists are working to control, outnumber Canada's whole population, and exceed the combined populations of Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Maryland, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Nevada, Montana, Wyoming, Arizona, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Colorado. These unfortunate people are human even as we are human, are suscepti-

ble just as we are susceptible to the persuasion of the man who gains personal hearing. Are we to leave them a prey to the intrigues of disguised revolutionists? Mr. Van H. Manning, the Director of the Bureau of Mines and Mining, referring to "considerable unrest in the mining industry during the war," said, "Certain radical elements, whose gospel is violence, interfered considerably with the output at a time when the *country was in dire need of their service*. Outside of the leaders of these men, whose intelligence consisted of cunning and preying upon the ignorance of other men, this movement obtained whatever prominence it had through the ignorant, illiterate foreign-born, those who came from the most oppressed sections of the world and whose battles America was endeavoring to fight."¹

The gospel of violence has also been carried to our native-born illiterates, in whatever industry they are found, also to the hospitable and credulous people of the mountains. The radicals, with the quiet of

¹ Statement to Committee on Education, House of Representatives, Feb. 15, 1919.

ground moles, have burrowed their way to our very homes, and now are telling us that they have done so, and that the future is theirs. But dense ignorance, the field of their first success, does not secure the future. The bolshevist utopias do not thrive in the light of intelligence. Here then is a work that needs to be done, and that needs to be done *now*.

The economic loss through illiteracy is a consideration. The Secretary of the Interior estimates that if the productive labor value of an illiterate is less by only 50 cents a day than that of an educated man or woman, the country is losing \$825,000,000 a year through illiteracy. The estimate by Mr. Herbert Kaufman is that we can safely figure the labor of an illiterate worth \$5 a week less than that of a man who can read; and that eight million informed people would yield the nation \$2,000,000,000 annually in excess of present earnings from this class,—“which \$2,000,000,000 annually would not only pay the interest on our war debt, but will soon amortize it as well.”¹

¹ Digest in re Smith-Bankhead Americanization Bill, Committee on Education, House of Representatives, February 15, 1919.

The economic loss appears in other ways. Each year the Federal Government spends millions of dollars in trying to give helpful information to the people of the rural districts about improved ways of farming, stock-raising and home-making. Yet 10 per cent of the country folk for whom these millions are spent cannot read a word of any communication sent to them, nor read a word in a farm paper, or on a bulletin placed at the road side. Certain it is also that eight and a half million people never read a line of any advertisement, and are never in the market for anything in print, however practically helpful and informing it may be.

The annual accidents and fatalities in industries are attributed mainly to ignorance and lack of training. Reports show that the non-English speaking miners suffer twice the fatalities that the English-speaking miners do, resulting in 930 more killed and 69,750 more injured annually,—which represents a wage loss of \$1,743,750; or through including the State compensation for deaths of—an—average \$3,000 each, represents an economic loss each year

of \$4,533,750 in one industry. This estimate does not include the loss to the industry in added cost of production. Here is something to think about when the winter's fire is low and we are bewailing the high price of coal. Such excess of accidents and deaths among the non-English speaking miners may seem unnecessary—and almost unthinkable—but the fact stands, the record is recurrent.

This is not an hour for the time-will-cure philosophy. Illiteracy with its certain attendant sufferings, economic loss, perils and handicap ought to be removed, both for the welfare of State and for the salvation and human interests of these people. Day schools ought to be strengthened. Mission schools of churches ought to be multiplied. And the moonlight school, the night school, and the shop school—whatever will meet the need—ought to be supported. Sympathy too is needed; the touch of the man or woman having the true American spirit, and in whose feelings and friendship, ideals and ideas, the unlettered will find light, and leading, and inspiration. That is a work

that will make for an enduring democracy. These people, often soul starved, need to receive of our hearts as well of our heads, —not patronage, not “for the unco’ bad by the unco’ good,” but as from fellow human-kind, fellow Americans and fellow children of God. Must we not also enlarge national and state plans for education? To that end, indeed if the present (inadequate) educational force is to be maintained, teachers must be meted justice. Teachers in the main are not self-seeking, and are satisfied with teaching as their reward, but they must receive a living wage. Any other policy is short sighted, and dire results will attend it.

The statistics cited from the last census on illiteracy unquestionably understate the condition of to-day. The Surgeon-General of the Army only recently made public the results of the test applied for literacy, the test being a simple one: merely the reading of an American newspaper and the writing of a letter home. Yet 24.9 per cent or one in every four of our fine American men failed to pass the test. The number of illiterates has increased since the last census

by natural increase in population and by influx of immigration. Here the bolsheviks find soil suited to the seed of their sowing. The question now is not what can *be said* in defense of a world-leading democracy wherein 10 to 24 per cent of its people cannot read its laws, but what can *be done* for preserving that democracy!

The futility of the let-alone policy is also shown by what it has *not* accomplished with the negro population. Since the franchise was given negroes, whose training for that trust was a century of ignorance, lust and superstition, what has happened? Did the gift of the ballot, which they could not read, qualify them as citizens? Has time evolved the needed qualities? Has time solved the negro problem? Instead, time has intensified it. The negroes have grown in number more rapidly than their white neighbors. Whenever negroes held political supremacy, ruin and bankruptcy followed. They have not fulfilled the prophecy that they would rise as a race to great mentality. Under the let-alone policy they have developed criminal possibilities and qualified as dangerous classes.

“In 1913 Chicago’s 2 per cent negro population furnished 6.9 per cent of the total arrests, 14.6 per cent of the arrests for larceny, 27.8 per cent of the arrests for assault with deadly weapons, 9.3 per cent of the convictions for felonies and 14 per cent for misdemeanors. In Cincinnati, in 1912, the 5 per cent negro population furnished 19.5 per cent of the deaths from pulmonary tuberculosis, 9.54 per cent of the total mortality, 33.27 per cent of the workhouse inmates, 22 per cent of all city hospital admissions, 19.88 per cent of the dependent children handled, 33 per cent of delinquent children handled and, in 1913, 35 per cent of the registered prostitutes. . . . Another fact of great importance should be considered. The negro as a race has not the loyalty to our national institutions which he had forty years ago. This is not strange. It is due to disappointed hopes and expectations.”¹

The National Security League recently issued a report,² which is the result of a two-year investigation in the South by

¹ See Editorial Page, *Chicago Daily News*, February 19, 1919.

² August, 1919.

Dean L. B. Moore, who says: "The Southern States, with their seething millions of restless negro population, are becoming potential volcanoes. The recent action of the American Federation of Labor in admitting colored men to its organization was taken because the blacks are being organized by the Industrial Workers of the World. Never before have I known such sensitiveness in a situation as I now discern in the racial relations in the South. I have found a suspicious and latent hostility that seems amazingly impossible. Any blind man, knowing the conditions in the South, could plainly see what is likely to result in a few years unless educational conditions are bettered. The confusion following the Civil War will be nothing compared with what we shall have here. Frankly, we are in danger of having a little Russia in many sections of the Southland. The false teachers to-day who are encouraging lawlessness are in a large measure responsible for the exodus of negro labor to the North. The race riots are the products of a spirit of contempt for law joined to ignorance."

The "negro problem" is the white man's problem,—and is now in the North just as it has long been in the South and the great Middle West.¹ The clashes in northern cities, illy concealed antagonism, demands for separate schools in those centers where negro migration has largely increased the negro population—all these show that the negro problem is no longer sectional, but is national and demands attention as of common concern.

Emotional, mainly illiterate, grievances both real and imagined, the negroes have been easily moved to suspicion, indifference and antagonism by the teachers of violence who seek the overthrow of the present social order that the bolshevist *class* may rule.

It is no longer merely a question of helping the negroes but also of helping our country and saving ourselves. Here again time has not cured. Lynchings have not cured, but have added fuel to flame. By that method, the innocent frequently pay penalty for the guilty. Then the negroes, moved by resentment and fear, reason,

¹ Of the 11 million negroes in the United States, one-fourth live in the North.

“Honesty doesn’t protect. Who will be the next?”

Education and religion are the only means of taking the negroes out of the range of criminal possibilities, and of making them loyal and industrious citizens. Dr. A. Eugene Thomson, Principal of the Lincoln Institute of Kentucky, made a study of ten prominent colored schools in the South. Some had been graduating classes for thirty-five years. Altogether they had graduated 7,769 students. Asking how many of their graduates had ever been convicted of a criminal offense—that is, anything involving a penalty from a jail sentence upward—he found that seven of the ten schools had a clean record. The reports showed ten out of 7,769, or less than one-eighth of 1 per cent, convicted.

Lincoln, Hampton, Tuskegee and similar schools have demonstrated the value of vocational training of negroes, under Christian auspices. Through many years these schools have turned out large numbers of men and women who have “made good” as industrious, law-abiding Christian citizens. This is a work that pays many-

fold. To quote Edward T. Leach, Editor of the *Memphis Press*, "Leaving out all sentiment, if you want to look at it in a cold blooded way, which is the more valuable to the community in dollars and cents, which will cost the State less, a good negro or a bad one?"

Is it not the indisputable conclusion that the solution of the negro problem is Christian education and vocational training? Various church Boards of Freedmen are doing just such work. The United States Bureau of Education reports 6,258 schools for the higher education of negroes, mainly supported by Northern churches and philanthropy at a cost of \$3,000,000. Many of the schools are known as "colleges," but 75 per cent of the 87,000 pupils are in elementary grades, 11,500 in secondary departments and only 1,500 are real college students.

The Southern states are doing a large work, spending often a larger percentage of State income than do other states; and spending yearly about one-third of a million dollars on industrial and normal schools for negroes. Yet, all told, school

provision is not adequate to the needs. About 43 per cent of negro children between the ages of six and fourteen are unprovided for. Southern states report that 50 per cent of all negro public school teachers had less than six elementary grades of schooling, and that in the rural districts, where 75 per cent of the race live, the number of poorly prepared teachers is much larger. Under such conditions, is it surprising that negroes comprise 40 per cent of the illiterates of the United States?

Another particular evidence of the need of Christian education for these people is their clergy. Every year calls for 1500 new negro pastors to fill vacancies caused by death and old age. But all the schools and colleges of our country, South, North, East, and West can not supply a full 300 educated men,—which means that 1200 uneducated “ministers” take their places as negro leaders. Too often this means “the blind leading the blind,” inflammatory speeches, the exciting of race prejudice, indolence, moral laxness, and economic loss,—all of which make favoring conditions

for bolshevist propaganda. Ex-President Taft recently deplored such leadership and also referred to another class of negro leaders who "are wiser," and who "see that the way to ameliorate conditions is not by direct frontal attacks of resentment or revenge but by the education of their people and a stimulation of them to greater industry and economic success."¹

To educate negro leaders—teachers and ministers—who will lead their people in orderly, industrious and Christian ways is an urgent need of the hour. Certain it is that the let-alone policy with the negro population will get us nowhere—except into trouble.

The negroes must be taught how to work with their hands and that work is honorable. They must be given Christian education and vocational training. And too the negro must be given a square deal, and recognized as a human being and an authenticated child of God. We must interpret America in the terms of fair play, justice and humanity, insisting on return in kind. That is Americanization in the

¹ Cincinnati *Enquirer*, June 2, 1919.

concrete; that is Christianity practically applied. And in this particular there is no other way out.

In these illustrations which show that time does not cure, we directly face certain conditions that foster the Great Menace, and that must be changed if that peril is to be removed. Our foreign-born citizenry, illiterates, and negroes, however, are not the only ones who have been seduced by socialism. Many sincere, noble-minded people have been enticed to its pale by assurances of an immediate golden age, not knowing that instead of a golden age it means an age *washed with blood*, a despotism of the most ruthless order. These innocent converts to socialism have believed it a creed of peace,—and so it once was, and now is with men of peace. But other leaders have usurped control; socialism has been perverted to the tool of a self-seeking group of a class and advocates of violence. Socialism as a peaceful proposal for economic or other reforms has right to speak and right to be heard in a free country. In that event we have only to point out that wherever it

has been tried it has added to the miseries of humankind, instead of mitigating them. But now if socialism comes to us with peaceful proposals, it also comes with blood upon its hands and with sinister purposes in its thoughts. Even the "parlor socialists" are despised by the proletarian socialists who alone expect to rule. Any persons who are a little educated are abhorred as intellectuals. Parts of Russia are mortuaries for slaughtered *intelligentsia*. It is not necessary to substantiate this statement. No truth of what has happened in Russia under bolshevism is more conspicuous. However, I wish to make reference to one recent publication, "Under the Bolshevik Reign of Terror,"¹ by a young Englishwoman, Miss Rhoda Power, who relates her experiences in the south-Russian town of Rostof, where she lived from early in the war until after the Bolsheviks came into power. She tells of what she personally knew, and describes at length the excesses of the Red Guard. A part of the story is in the form of a diary, from which are the following excerpts:

¹ McBride & Co., publishers, New York.

“March 3. Blood, blood, blood. March 5. On the other side of the road a student was walking. ‘Ha,’ cried a tovarish, another of the intelligentsia. ‘So you will educate yourself above the people, will you? There.’ And he shot him through the head. The boy fell with a little cry, and before he was quite dead his clothes were taken off and sold to a passing peasant.” The unreasoning prejudice against the “intellectuals” which prevails in Russia prevails also with the bolsheviki in America.

When the spirit of this movement in America is uncovered, we find that its purpose is autocracy, *rule by a group of a class*. Once in power, would any man’s blood be held dear? Even the farmers here, as in Russia, would be classed among the intellectuals, denied equal voice in government, and would be ruled by despots. But such régime cannot be when the American people are fully aroused to what the radicals are trying to bring to pass.

The encouragement in the crisis of the present time is our *faith in the people*, the vast majority of whom desire to know the right and to do right. We should disillu-

sion those who have been misled. And we should do our work in the mighty confidence that the *moral sense and common sense of the people can be depended on to do right and to defend the right*. Though faith in individuals and in groups of men is tried, we yet must have faith in humankind. Now, a word as to our ground for this belief. Man is a being with a dual nature. Do we not all confess to a downward pull, to a tendency to indulgence, and to yield to lusts and passion, selfish ambition, personal aggrandizement and power? Every one who has dared to choose the good as the goal of life, knows only too well that evil is present with him. Why do we not also acknowledge that in every one is the upward impulse, aspiring for things noble, pure, beautiful and true, for the experience of service and the expression of kindness, love and selfless devotion? In all is the good, and no one is so bad as not to have impulses to follow it. This is a teaching that needs to be emphasized in present-day thinking, for it is a truth that in certain places has suffered eclipse. There is good even in "bad people" to

which one can make successful appeal. Various fields of moral and religious activity in recent years bear testimony to this fact. The work with juvenile delinquents in Boy Republics and Parental Republics, and of Judge Lindsey in Denver shows that appeal to the good in "bad boys" is often successful. Dr. Bernardo organized the system for taking boy criminals out of the slums of the great cities of England, and sending them to farms in Australia, South Africa, and Canada. Out of 50,000 such boys who were given a new chance through the farm environment less than two per cent, according to Dr. Bernardo, have shown any tendency to revert to their earlier criminal practices.

The testimony that comes from the field of criminology is further illustration of the fact of good in "bad people," even in the criminal classes. Prison reform and new methods of penology have converted prison places of torture into moral hospitals. Outstanding is the work of Lombroso in Italy, of Thomas Mott Osborne and Maud Ballington Booth in America, in reclaiming many mature criminals, who in time past

would have been regarded as hopelessly hardened. And too the experiences of thousands of ministers in the conversion of "hopeless cases," morally speaking, also testifies to the good in "bad folks." *Much more then is our ground for faith in the people, the law abiding of our land!* History shows that they always could be trusted, that they always could be depended on. *The people* are our confidence in the crisis of the present, and our assurance for a continued orderly society in the future. When the purpose of the Great Menace is fully known it will meet their united opposition. The people will not tolerate the red flag, nor allow any hyphenated flag. Americans love dearer than life the American flag. They have sung:

"Flag of the brave! thy folds shall fly,
The sign of hope and triumph high."¹

If necessary the American people will again fight to keep Old Glory waving high.

It would be unfortunate for "labor" and for our country if the radicals of labor are permitted to effect strained relations

¹ Joseph Rodman Drake, *The American Flag*.

and suffering conditions that ultimately must precipitate trouble. As a people we wish to avoid bloodshed; but we will maintain at any cost our country's honor and an orderly society for the sake of our children and the common good.

The sane and major part of "labor" is not in sympathy with soviet radicals,—this we must keep in mind. The following excerpt from an editorial in the *Labor Herald*¹ is typical, I believe, of the sound, good sense of labor people in the main: "The soviet fanatics nowadays seek to superimpose the soviet idea in every situation where there is a conflict between workers and employers. . . Democracy offers the best chance for the most people to have a say about how things are run. That is the reason why the soviet is a dead duck in America. The soviet fanatics who think they can put over their idea in America have it in their heads that if they can do that then their little group can run things. Whatever may be the true definition of a soviet, the definition that is in the minds of its supporters on this side

¹ Newport, Ky., July 10, 1919.

of the Atlantic is a machine that will bring about a 'dictatorship of the proletariat,' which means by a small group of workers who happen to agree upon the idea. . . Democracy is a winner against anything the world knows about in the way of governments. It gives the most people a chance for a say. The thing that Lenine and Trotsky dare not do is to give the most people a say. Only if democratic peoples let their democracy slip away from them is there any need to fear for them. And they haven't done that yet! Some day we'll look at soviet propaganda through glass cases in long marble corridors in buildings, over the doors of which we will read the word 'museums.' "

The dependableness of *the people* gives ground for confidence. At the same time we acknowledge that wrongs do not right themselves. Time does not cure. The people look to the leaders to lead. We must make known the intent of socialism, which will languish and perish in the sunlight of truth. Before us too is the imperative need of removing illiteracy, of Americanizing our foreign-born population, and

of providing Christian education and vocational training for the negroes; so shall we dig out the big roots of the Great Menace, which has *got to go*. Otherwise democracy cannot live.

IV

THE NEW PATRIOTISM

“Work or starve.
Save or want.
Play together or you’ll play hell.
Be a good American or get out.”¹

IN the light of world changes and menacing internal conditions in our country, certain great ideas and principles have suddenly assumed profound significance. These ideas and principles, if not new, appeal to loyal Americans with a new emphasis, and, therefore, may concisely be called the new patriotism. What are the great convictions that suddenly have forced themselves in upon the minds of men with such profound significance?

I. We can best approach the question by stating first what the new patriotism is not.

1. At the outset of this part of the discussion we may affirm that the new patriotism is not internationalism. Unless a man is first loyal to his own home, he is not loyal

¹ *Saturday Evening Post*, October 4, 1919, p. 29.

to the community. Similarly with nations. How can any country be worthy of a place in the council of nations except by a worthy and law-abiding citizenry? The urgency of world peace requires fidelity to one's country. That fidelity does not overlook the burning hope of men that the vision of Tennyson in *Locksley Hall* may be realized:

“The war-drum throbbed no longer, and the battle-flags were furl’d
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.”

We cannot forget the appalling cost of maintaining the free governments of people: 26 million casualties, 11 million men killed, and 221 billion dollars. All this must not have been in vain. The American people ask as the fruit of victory that the world shall be protected against the repetition of such a catastrophe. And we honor nations of like mind and purpose,—but that is not reason for foolish talk of an impossible internationalism where our thought for other nations holds equal place as for our own. “To say that one can love

other nations as well as one's own is like saying," to quote words spoken by Colonel Roosevelt shortly before he died, "that a man can love other women equally as well as he loves his wife."

2. In the second place the new patriotism is not materialism. In Germany material forces had outgrown spiritual forces. Science placed great physical powers in the hands of the German nation, but conscience and judgment did not keep pace with its intelligence. Moral and spiritual control were lost, and the wonderful physical forces, the gift of science to the German people, were turned into an engine of destruction, under the name of Kultur. The American people cannot live alone on things material any better than the German people could so live. Without spiritual guidance and moral control we would come to grief just as they have come to grief. This does not belittle science. Science is a friend, and daily brings material marvels for the health and comfort of men and the advancement of civilization. But the new physical powers can wield permanent good and build a nation in enduring strength

only as controlled by enduring principles. All this has been demonstrated,—a demonstration forced by Germany, and for which the world has paid the price. Our present concern is to apply the principle, that man cannot live by the material alone, to our several affairs and national life. Do we place the common good above personal gain? Do we value spiritual possession more than material possessions? Is America's satisfaction in the quality of men that it breeds or in the material wealth of its industries and material splendor of its institutions? Do we honor men for what they are or what they have? What are the motives that impel young men and women in choice of education or vocation? Do we serve God or Mammon? Germany stood for materialism. That was her faith, law and life. Materialism is with other people exactly what it was with the German people: cruel, selfish, and criminal. Suffering and ruin always attend it. The new patriotism is not materialism.

3. It must also be said that the new patriotism is not partisan. It affirms that America belongs to *the people*; that we do

not have and must not have class rule or class preferment; that ours is a Land of Opportunity for all, that that is its glory and one of the things that has made it the greatest nation of all time.

Greenville, Tenn., is a little town two miles long and one street wide. Two signs, one at either end of that street, tell a story of opportunity that lies before the feet of every American citizen. At one end of the street is a sign over a tumbledown one-story frame shack which reads "A. Johnson, Tailor." At the other end of the street, shining and towering high, is a marble monument on which is the inscription "A. Johnson, President of the United States." From an ignorant tailor unable to read or write A. Johnson became the nation's chief executive. Where such a thing is possible, there can be no class. True, not every boy can become President, but there is the chance for every young American to make his way *up the street* to any worthy goal he sets for himself if he has the will to win. But he cannot reach it through idleness or waste, or if disheartened by difficulties. Emerson said, "Difficulties make a bright boy climb." Long-

fellow voiced the American sentiment in saying:

“The heights by great men reached and kept
Were not attained by sudden flight,
But they, while their companions slept,
Were toiling upward in the night.”¹

The new patriotism is not partisan. It does not leave us in the dark, though we are in the throes of great problems. Our methods for the settling of problems are the methods of democracy,—the methods which were established when the Constitution of the United States was framed. At that time, our American fathers who framed it were in the thick of problems and could not visualize the future, its tremendous changes, expansion of country, industrial development, the effect of inventions, influx of immigration, and increasing complexities and perplexities in social relations. They could not forecast all that. But they were united in the conviction that free men could retain the powers of self-government only through acceptance of the responsibilities of self-government and ad-

¹ “The Ladder of St. Augustine.”

herence to the methods of democracy, (δῆμος people + κρατεῖν to rule) the rule of the people. By those methods the great problems that have arisen in our nation have been adjusted. And the great problems in our country to-day will be settled in the same satisfactory way. "The American people," declares John P. Frey, who was a member of the American Labor Mission in Europe last year, "are so devoted to these democratic institutions, so jealous of the benefits which they convey, that they had already placed 2,000,000 Americans on French soil and were prepared to place millions more, so that the free institutions which they believed in could not be jeopardized by the success of the autocratic, militaristic Central Powers."¹ That observation by a leader of labor voices the sentiment of loyal Americans. They will stand four-square for democracy which does not admit dominance of a class.

The new patriotism is not internationalism, not materialism, not the favoritism of, or rule by, a class.

¹ *Labor Herald*, October 2, 1919, pp. 1, 2.

II. This brings us directly to our main thought: what the new patriotism is.

1. In the first place the new patriotism affirms the principle of interdependence. Our lives are inter-related, mutually dependent, bound up together. We must learn, if we have not, how to *live on* with one another, each considering his particular interests in the light of the good of all. Labor has its rights, capital has rights, and the people have their rights. And the rights of one can be promoted in ways of lasting value only in harmony with the common rights of all. Policy or conduct must be governed by its effect on all the people. Any other policy is ruthless materialism.

2. The new patriotism also stands for constructive liberalism. Impatience with the methods and aims of socialism, and sometimes with the unrest and unreasonable demands of certain groups of labor has had a tendency to make many persons become reactionary. But that would be fatal to progress. Reactionary policy, resort to the old methods of industrial despotism, would make converts to bolshevism,

A democracy cannot consent to the dictatorship of capital or of the proletariat. The extremists on both sides are headed for trouble. They too are making trouble for others, resulting in discordant conditions. That is the sure way of crystallizing public sentiment for drastic action, if not experiment, and taking in hand the trouble makers. That very thing will be done if it needs to be done, but the energy thus diverted would defer the day of the common well-being and happiness of all. The sane way is to face problems in a spirit of constructive liberalism, working for solution in recognition of the rights of all. That will mean often a tremendous task, but big undertakings have summoned the American people before,—and will inspire them again. Anything can be done that *ought* to be done. Surely the problems of our social order ought to be solved, to the end of justice, brotherhood, and good-will. Can one be loyal to country and not contribute by sympathy or suggestion to the solution?

3. The new patriotism also includes merciful helpfulness, when help is needed

and ought to be meted. The bountiful gifts from men and women through the war, best of all the merciful giving of themselves without stint, was a beautiful touch that helped to mitigate the horrors, and gave us heart to bear the burdens, of those dark hours. Noble inner natures came into view. In the light of that merciful helpfulness, we also saw selfishness as a thing hideous and loathsome,—selfishness that yet skulks in the dark or masquerades in honest dress but always with murder in its thought. However, merciful helpfulness is the breath and soul of America, and the glory of the new patriotism.

4. This brings us to another most important point in regard to the new patriotism, one with which at first hearing some persons will not agree. Yet, no word is more urgently needed in this time of unrest—largely awakened and fostered by the Great Menace—and no one word in the light of glaring facts is more transparently true than the statement that if one is to be a loyal American to-day one *must* support and promote the moral and spiritual life of the nation.

When William N. Foster, Secretary of the National Committee that organized the strike of the steel and iron workers, was a witness before the Senate Committee which was investigating the strike,¹ Senator McKellar, in addressing the witness, said:

"I now call your attention to page 18 of your book on Syndicalism, where you say: 'The Syndicalist is as unscrupulous in his choice of weapons to fight his every-day battles as for his final struggle with capitalism. He allows no consideration of 'legality' 'religion' 'patriotism,' 'honor,' 'duty,' and so forth, to stand in the way of his adoption of effective tactics. The only sentiment he knows is loyalty to the interests of the working class. He is in utter revolt against capitalism in all its phases. His lawless course often lands him in jail, but he is so fired by revolutionary enthusiasm that jails, or even death, have no terrors for him. He glories in martyrdom, consoling himself with the knowledge that he is a terror to his enemies, and that his movements, to-day

¹ October 2, 1919.

sending chills along the spines of international capitalism, to-morrow will put an end to this monstrosity.' Is that your belief now?"

Foster answered: "If you put all those terms in quotation marks, that stands."

Think of it! Here is a leader of labor, a member of a national committee representing several hundred thousand workers in the steel and iron industry and that organized its recent strike, confessing that he believes it his duty and the duty of all syndicalists to allow no considerations of "legality," "religion," "patriotism," "honor" or "duty" to stand in the way of the adoption of effective tactics to secure their ends. When groups of labor are indoctrinated with that sort of teaching, is it surprising that sovietism has spread? or that the followers of that doctrine are opposed to religion? For that condition, those persons who believe otherwise, but who do nothing to promote the moral and spiritual life of the nation are heavily responsible. The Church has proclaimed the laws of God, without which

a nation cannot stand, and which now are openly defied,—but that work has not been reasonably sustained. To the call for repentance and religious coöperation vast multitudes of intelligent people have been indifferent, regardless alike of the perils of country, the sufferings of their fellows, and the reasonable claims of the Holy God. The poor, benighted foreign-born in America, who yielded to bolshevist teaching were misled,—that is their excusing. But vast multitudes, too self-absorbed in the pursuit of gain or pleasure to thoughtfully consider the moral and spiritual need of the nation or ever to read a labor paper, *knew better*. Possibly they did not realize that dire consequences would follow their conduct,—that may be their excusing. Will they retrieve the past by helping to meet the moral and spiritual need of America now?

I am not pleading for any particular church or synagogue or ism but for *spiritual witness and service somewhere*. If there is a better agency than the Church for doing this particular work, many of us would like to know it. Until other agency

is found, why not support and promote what we have?

The teaching of the syndicalists that they are to be "unscrupulous in their choice of weapons," and that it is their duty to allow "no consideration of legality, religion, patriotism," etc. to stand in the way of their "adoption of effective tactics" in obtaining their ends, evinces that our fundamental need is religion, the recovery of the ten commandments, a revival of the things of God,—which may and may not mean a revival of revivalism. It does mean a revival of religion. Other conditions to-day than those effected by the socialists and syndicalists show that this is true: the prevalence and open insolence of evil, profiteers, hoarding of goods for effecting fictitious prices, unjust wage and unjust wage demands, the "coal scandal," the selfish seizure by certain persons of every possible advantage for gain in ruthless disregard of the sufferings of one's fellows, and the effort to fatten upon a great national calamity like the last war—that too when loyal American sons were sacrificing business, home and all things that democracy might not perish from the

earth,—all this shows the imperative need in this our country of “a pure and undefiled religion.” That fact stands out in letters of light over against the thick darkness of present conditions and the history of recent years.

We have come to a parting of the ways. Shall America be the home of a lived religion or of bolshevism?—that is the question. By promoting or not promoting the moral and spiritual life of the nation, one’s answer is given. It is a point of honor now; not sentiment but patriotism. Notice is served that the ten commandments and all religion have been ruled out. If the ruling extends and remains, democracy will end, the way will be open to violence and mob rule. The time has come for an alignment of those people who believe that the laws: “Thou shalt not kill,” “Thou shalt not steal,” “Thou shalt have no other gods before me” are fundamental to civilization.

That America requires before anything else an applied religion for the crisis of to-day, is the thought recently—and independently—expressed by three American

business men, nationally known and whose judgments are valued as observers of national conditions and world movements. Robert W. Babson, editor of Babson's Barometer Letter to Merchants, Bankers and Investors, Boston, in a signed editorial,¹ said, "The need of the hour is not more legislation. The need of the hour is more religion. More religion is needed everywhere, from the halls of Congress at Washington, to the factories, mines, fields and forests. It is one thing to talk about plans and policies, but a plan and policy without a religious motive is like a watch without a spring, or a body without the breath of life. The trouble to-day is that we are trying to hatch chickens from sterile eggs. We may have the finest incubator in the world and operate it according to the most approved regulations; moreover, the eggs may appear perfect specimens, but unless they have the germ of life in them, all of our efforts are of no avail. . . . The solving of the Labor situation is wholly a question of religion. The wage worker will never be satisfied with

¹ September 2, 1919.

higher wages and shorter hours, any more than you and I are satisfied with more profits and a bigger house. Things never did satisfy any one and never will. Satisfaction and contentment are matters of religion. Communities and industries, where right motives are paramount, have no serious labor problems. When both employer and wage worker honestly believe that we are here in this world to serve others, the Labor problem will be solved, but not until then. We employers should learn to give up, and labor should wake up. However, neither of us will do it except as we are actuated by religious motives. Both groups are largely actuated by selfish motives at the present time. Moreover, this is tremendously shortsighted selfishness. During the scramble over a division of what is already produced, we overlook the great importance of increasing production, thereby cutting down the tree to get the cherries. We all need a new outlook of life, a new political policy, a new industrial policy, and a new social policy. The old politics founded upon fear and striving only for protection has

fulfilled its usefulness. We need a new politics based upon faith and striving for production. Meanwhile, what is happening to our churches? They are going to seed. They are already deserted by the working classes, and are being deserted by the children of the employing classes. Great capital investments in land and buildings are being utilized only a few hours a week. The ministers are being paid starvation wages, and the whole church industry lacks pep and imagination. And yet, the Church is the only organization in existence for generating right motives in man. Schools develop intellect, theaters and novels foster passion, but the Church is the sole organization which develops those good motives of love, sympathy, hope and inspiration, upon which the industrial salvation of the world depends. . . . But that great organization which has the machinery and opportunity to develop the constructive motives of love, sympathy and hope, is asleep. . . . When Jesus told His disciples to 'give to him that asketh of thee' He did not mean that they should die of starvation. He simply

tried to emphasize the great fundamental truth that life consists not in hoarding or living on what is hoarded; but life consists in working and using what one produces. It was Jesus' method of calling the world's attention to the fact that the things which exist are temporary, and at best would keep the world alive only a few months. He wished to impress upon us that our future depends not upon hoarding what we have, but rather on producing more. He wished to direct mankind's attention toward Faith and away from Fear; toward Production and away from Protection. Politics and industries need to get Jesus' point of view, which is both economically and psychologically sound. Labor troubles would soon cease, and the Cost of Living would be cut in halves. Once more I say, the need of the hour is religion."

Mr. Richard H. Edmonds, editor of the *Manufacturers' Record*, Baltimore, in a signed editorial,¹ expressed as strong convictions, saying:

"Above all else this country needs a nation-wide revival of old-fashioned prayer

¹ August 28, 1919.

meeting religion—a religion that makes men realize that if there is a heaven, there must also of necessity be a hell—a religion that makes a man realize that every act is recorded on his own conscience and that though it may slumber it can never die—a religion that makes an employer understand that if he is unfair to his employees and pays them less than fair wages, measured by his ability and their efficiency and zeal, he is a robber—a religion that makes an employee know that if he does not give full and efficient service, he too is a robber—a religion that makes a man realize that by driving too hard a bargain with his servant, his employee, his merchant, he can be just as much a profiteer as the seller or producer who swindles by false weight, false packing or false charges—a religion that will teach church members to contribute to the extent of their ability to the support of religion and that compels them to recognize that if they are paying their pastor less than a living salary, they are robbing God and man alike. In short we need a revival of religion which will make every man and woman strive in every act

of life to do that which on the great judgment day they will wish that they had done, as with soul uncovered they stand before the judgment seat of the Eternal. In the Golden Rule followed in the fullness of the spirit of this kind of religion, there would be found a solution for every business trouble; there would be created friendship between employer and employee; capital and labor would work in harmony and with efficiency, efficiency for the capital and efficiency for the labor, with profit to both. It is not merely in the chanting of hymns here or in the world to come, but it is in the recognition and full application by rich and poor, by learned and unlearned, that each is indeed his brother's keeper, that we can bring this country and the world back to safety. A nation-wide acceptance of this, the only true religion in action, would bring business peace and world peace where there is now turmoil, and men would then cease to seek to gain their ends by lawless immorality."

Mr. Herbert C. Hoover recently spoke a word of similar meaning. "What is needed," he said, "is what for want of a

better term I would call a spiritual revival. Somehow and by some means the sense of service that dominated the allied peoples must be revived.”¹

Can any one, seeing the world as it is to-day, read such words and not be stirred in mind and heart? Here are the profound convictions from men in the world—a world in trouble—that the present-day need is religion, and that the Church ought to meet the need. But how can it measure to the magnitude of the demand if people who believe in religion only wish the Church well and do not help it by their presence *to do well*?

What a chance to serve the nation! What a challenge for the spiritual slacker! If not aroused now, who can forecast the future? Has he regard for his own children? Religion is the great need of to-day.

5. The new patriotism not only includes support and promotion of morality and religion, but also stands for economy. It ought to be a badge of honor to-day to wear

¹ *Congregationalist and Advance*, October 16, 1919, p. 521.

old clothes, and to live simply rather than extravagantly. When James Russell Lowell was married economy was a stern necessity with him as with many others of that time. Men of vision believed economy necessary also for the *general welfare*. "A Do Without Club" was organized, of which Mr. and Mrs. Lowell were members. To keep a dinner engagement one evening shortly after they were married, they walked four miles across the city of Boston that they might save the cost of carriage hire.

With the present under production and high cost of living ought we to have another "Do Without Club"? One pathway to improved conditions is self-denial, saving and thrift.

"Extravagance and display have been prime causes of unrest of the less fortunate. Reckless spending on self-indulgence has too often fanned the flames of discontent. The constitutional right to private property is often so abused as to be inconsistent with that other constitutional provision, 'the general welfare.' It is possible to stand firmly on the right to

private property and at the same time interpret that right for the benefit of others as well as self. If we are to rescue ourselves from our present state we must practice economy both personally and publicly. The national Congress must set the example and the people must follow. Already there is talk of another bond issue on top of the \$24,000,000,000 already issued between April, 1917, and October, 1919. A deficit of more than \$3,000,000,000 at the end of this fiscal year stares the federal government in the face. How is this deficit to be met except by bonds or by higher taxes? Already the people have been unable to absorb the war bonds issued. The banks are carrying several billions partly paid for, while the Federal Reserve banks are understood to be carrying war paper amounting to \$1,380,000,000. Prices are abnormal largely because of excessive issues of credit money and the issue of immense quantities of government bonds. Both paper money and bonds are in the last analysis debts—liabilities of the people which the people must pay. How does

a private citizen in a financial hole manage to settle? By economy, by saving. If the people ever expect to pay their public debts they must practice thrift and return to the old-fashioned rule of economy. If we would escape being called a nation of 'spendthrifts' and 'extravagant wasters' we must restore to our vocabulary and our practical activity the word 'economy.' Let that word be written on the door of every palace as well as of every more humble abode. It is the key to industrial content and financial safety."¹

6. Present-day patriotism must also be intelligent. This fact has been too clearly demonstrated to require word of confirmation. But we must remember the fact! "The ultimate foundation of every State," says Seeley, "is a way of thinking." Suspicion and distrust within a nation lead to division, suffering conditions, and often to violence. And suspicion and distrust of one another among nations usually lead to war. For enduring peace among men and nations there must be enlightenment, and

¹ New York *Herald*, editorial, Oct. 12, 1919.

the implanting in the minds of men right ideas and principles as a foundation on which to build the new social order of justice.

7. Present-day patriotism must also stand for 1000 per cent pure Americanism. There must be no divided allegiance. This is not selfish. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." And only as we make America strong, can it serve the world. Insistence on absolute loyalty to our country, however, must not prejudice against naturalized citizens or citizens of "foreign" descent. It is a glory of America that it has had welcome for people of almost every tongue and land of the known world, who have here lived and worked harmoniously side by side, an example of brotherhood and democracy to all mankind. But certain disloyal have been found within our gate, and certain others such as the bolshevists and syndicalists are seeking to foment unrest and incite to violence. Either one stands for 1000 per cent pure Americanism or one does not. Either one is wholly for the stars and stripes or one is not. Loyalty admits no compromise.

Such, I believe, is the new patriotism. It is not internationalism, not materialism, not the favoritism of, or rule by, a class. The new patriotism first of all affirms the principle of interdependence, which means that our lives are mutually dependent, bound up together. Second, it stands for constructive liberalism, which works for the common well-being and happiness of all as opposed to reactionary policy or the methods of bolshevism. Third, it stands for merciful helpfulness when help is needed and ought to be given. Fourth, it affirms that truly loyal Americans in these crucial post-war times must support and promote the moral and spiritual life of the nation. Fifth, it stands for economy, believing that one inescapable pathway to improved economic conditions is self-denial, saving, and thrift. Sixth, it declares that present-day patriotism must be intelligent; and, lastly, the new patriotism stands for 1000 per cent pure Americanism, with undivided devotion to one flag —

“Flag of the free heart’s hope and home!

Forever float that Standard Sheet!

Where breathes the foe but falls before us,
With Freedom's soil beneath our feet,
And Freedom's banner streaming o'er us?"¹

I have called this the new patriotism. In the highest and truest sense it is also the old patriotism, for it includes that which is fundamental to American democracy, and is the patriotism that will continue so long as democracy endures.

¹ Joseph Rodman Drake, *The American Flag*.

V

VITAL MESSAGES OF RELIGION FOR TO-DAY

WITH recent great world changes new ideas have come rushing into the minds of men like a loosened flood, looking to radical changes even in the field of religious thought and work.

When that returned Y worker, a clergyman, stood in an American pulpit, and declared his hope that the whole program of Church work and preaching would be changed, what did he mean? I do not know. I heard the remark, spoken with intensity and evident sincerity. But along with accompanying criticisms, I did not hear a single constructive conclusion. Is not this typical of much similar comment on religion and the Church?—positive, helpful suggestion is wanting. Criticisms have been so numerous that multitudes of people are bewildered, and thousands are asking: "What has been the effect of the war on the attitude of men toward churches, creeds, and religion? What

messages are vital to the needs of the present hour?"

Undoubtedly, this is a time when the Church must take account of the things of which men are thinking and of the new world in which they are living,—only so can it gain "the point of contact" with them. Undoubtedly, this is a time when the religious teacher ought to bring "forth out of his treasure things new and old," only so can he speak to present needs. Certain apparent facts light the way. Our age in these post-war times is marked by the resultant of a world cataclysm, political changes and social upheavals. How far the changes will go and their full influence upon religion, no man can say. But certain large characteristics of the ethical and religious life of to-day and of the attitude of the minds of men toward religion have come into view, just as great continents that once lifted themselves from the seas "took form and content." Must not these characteristics determine the emphasis in religious teaching, if the Church is to fulfill its ministry to this age? What are those characteristics?

First of all, I believe we may affirm that the people of to-day are thinking in the terms of *reality*. Men in the trenches have had to do with reality, with the horrors of war and the ravages of death, and some of the men have had to do with sufferings seven-fold worse than death. Men in the camps at home and abroad looked forward to like experiences. In imagination and in dedication they had literally given their bodies to the cross of service and, if need be, to the agonies of supreme sacrifice. They were part of a real war and had to do with a real world. When in Church, the Y hut, or religious service out under the stars in battle torn fields or on quiet hillsides beneath waving branches of over-shadowing forests, they had heart only for the *realities of religion*. Speakers who unwittingly tried substitutes: humorous stories, platitudes, vapid anecdotes, or philosophy, could not obtain hearing. Under such preaching, men would withdraw from a service. On the other hand, the story of the cross, the life and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, and other great vital messages interested the

men and held their attention. Such is the testimony that has come to me from scores of sources in my effort to obtain first-hand information on the results of religious work in the war.

The experiences in religious war work at home has been practically the same. Mr. Bernard Iddings Bell has given valuable data obtained by him when acting as civilian aide to the Senior Chaplain at Great Lakes Naval Training Station. For a year of his time, he superintended all chaplains' work in "Detention," where the men spent the first three weeks of their stay, and took a religion registration of nearly every man who came in. Mr. Bell's records show that he gave the chaplains' instruction on religion and morals two hundred and forty-seven times to groups composed of eighty-one thousand men. Mr. Bell "looked up" men of his own communion, and too knew of the experiences of other workers, pastors and chaplains, in conversation with large numbers of men. In speaking of this personal touch with "our boys," Mr. Bell says: "It is interesting to note what are some of the things

which they do *not* mention as alienating young men [from Churches]. Rarely does one hear that the ancient creeds are difficult to believe. Apparently the healthy, simple man in the street shares little of the intellectual doubtings of the musty browser among books. Few cite the selfish inadequacy of a faith which bids men save themselves from hell. That quaint and fearsome Calvinistic motive, so bothersome to Mr. Wells and Judge Lindsey, has, apparently, save in a few rural neighborhoods of the Southwest, never been presented to most young men of this generation. The disunity of Christendom bothers almost no one. Partly with regret it must be said that apparently the need for a reunited Church is felt at present chiefly by the clergy. Most of these young men had no fault whatever to find with the churches as such. All their criticism was leveled at church members. They had a notion that they did rather like Christianity—little as they know of it. . . . They were not irreligious. They were pathetically ready for spiritual leadership. They threw no bitter slurs at the faith that has

made saints and heroes of men like them in the ages past. One could not help but feel that many of them might become simple and happy Christian men, and that their younger brothers might never drift away at all, if only Christians might with penitence reconsecrate themselves, clergymen and people, to definite preaching of the fundamental faith, social worship of an objective Jesus, quiet fellowship in devotion, humble seeking to live a Christlike life, and unaffected utterance of the faith that is in them.”¹

Testimony could be multiplied showing that the men in the war, at home and abroad, having to do with stern reality, could, in the matter of religion, be interested only by the vital things of religion. Their temper, I believe, is the temper of the present age. A people who have been in the throes of a world war, and who now are undergoing consequent sufferings, and who, often bewildered, are facing intricate social and world problems, are not ready to give hearing to philosophy of rational-

¹ *Atlantic Monthly*, September, 1919, pp. 402 ff.

ism or the philosophy of religion, much less to the trappings of denominationalism. It is not that the people believe or that others of us believe that the millennium was effected by the war or that hearts were greatly purified thereby. The war may have had a good spiritual effect on those men who were "baptized with fire," which seems to have been the impression of observers like Donald Hankey and Ian Hay. But all testimony is that in the main our boys remained essentially as they were. However, the striking characteristic brought to light is that this present age which has had to do with grim, stern reality will give hearing in matters of religion, if at all, only to the real, vital things of religion. *Truth* has chance for a hearing,—the truth that is fundamental and essential to meeting the needs of the souls of men, where they are and as they are. The world is not large enough now even for religion and science to quarrel.

The lesson is of inestimable value. The discussions of theology (which are not to be despised), the affirming of a creed, or

the assertion that the Book of Jonah is history or that it is a parable will have no more weight in reaching the people of the present age than the one time discussion of how many angels can dance on the end of a needle or how many buttons ought to be placed on an ecclesiastical garment. The present age of reality can be reached only by the vital messages of religion, *interpreted in terms of present life*. If the Book of Jonah has such a message—and it has—why not give *the message*? declare its truth, not waste time quibbling about the vehicle of truth, be it history or parable. I cite this illustration of the Book of Jonah, as I believe the illustration suggestive of the thinking of men and women whose attitude is not that of indifference to vital piety but rather impatience with other than the vital things of Christianity. Truth is fundamental. Truth is essential. Truth is the great eternal changeless reality, and bears its own ear marks. Truth does not need to be labeled “theological,” or “denominational.” It can stand on its own legs, and make its own way if not clogged by platitudes and “vain repeti-

tions." Truth is power. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."¹

Bigotry, dogmatism, denominationalism, cannot feed the souls of men. If a man ask bread, why give him a stone? This is no wild outcry against creeds and denominations. Everybody has his creed—of some sort. The word *credo*, I BELIEVE, is significant. Creeds, which are but the systematized statements of religious beliefs, will doubtless have continued place in associations of religious people. And for such groups denominations will have value for convenience in worship and work. All persons in going into a place of worship prefer to know that they are going into one place rather than into another: into a Christian church, Mohammedan mosque, or Jewish temple. But once there, they can be influenced only by uplifting worship and a vital spiritualizing service. If that does not mean a "meeting" fundamentally dry, does it imply the sensational? Believing that it does, certain speakers have copied Rev. "Billy" Sunday's oddi-

¹ John VIII. 32.

ties: one leg gestures, grimaces, and extravagant utterances, but so have copied only the accidentals of Mr. Sunday, whose power is his spirit and message. The most sensational thing that certain speakers could do, would be *to say something, to speak a message* instead of platitudes, to declare real things out of a real spiritual experience instead of repeating fables and insipid anecdotes.

The real message to the real world must have, at least, flashes of inspiration: utterances that come with freshness and force, when hearers instinctively feel "Thus saith the Lord." Inspiration is closed only to the life that is closed to it. The Christ said, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth."¹ Living on the high plane of religion-reality where the voice of God is audible one will have courage to be one's self, to trust one's own thinking as enlightened by the Spirit of truth,—which, I believe, is the divine method for a teacher in bringing "forth

¹ John XVI. 12-13.

out of his treasure things new and old." So will one minister of the vital things of religion to the people of the present age who are thinking in the terms of reality. It follows, I believe, that any man who hopes that the whole preaching program of the Church will be changed, overlooks the fact that the fundamentals of the Christian religion do not change; overlooks that God in the nature of His being and man in the nature of his being remain the same.

We cannot conceive of God as other than a "constant quantity" and a constant quality. "He is the same yesterday, to-day and forever,"¹ constant in His love, wisdom, mercy and power. No man *can* think otherwise; nor would any one be satisfied with a changeable Infinite Being, or pay homage to Him as Creator, God over all.

Those persons who urge a complete change in religious teaching must have overlooked also that man is even yet body and spirit; and too must have overlooked the constancy of the constituent elements of his spiritual nature, variously mentioned as emotions, will, intellect, purpose, or

¹ Heb. XIII. 8.

again, by the words heart, soul, mind. The terms or words are those of convenience to represent, the psychologist would say, "different aspects of one substantive entity." Of the facts of the inner spiritual man: thought, desires, feelings, strivings, and yearning to know God and to come into right relations with God, we all do know. The constituent spiritual elements, though varying in degree of development, are characteristic of man, and by them he is differentiated and recognized; and these same spiritual elements plainly show why "man is incurably religious,"—a statement that is substantiated by observation, consciousness, and experience. The great quest of men has been to know God, to love and be loved by Him, and to serve Him. And such will be the endeavor of men in the future. True, the finer, nobler part of one's spiritual nature, the attempt of the finite to hold communion with the Infinite, may be dwarfed through abuse or disuse by individuals, groups, or generations, who may fall into thick darkness like that of the tenth century, yet the fact remains that man is man,

with a spiritual nature, spiritual needs, and, at least at times, with yearnings for God. Sin to men is not a theory, but a fact; and all who think cry out for redemption. The need, therefore, for certain vital religious truths continues.

It may be a little old fashioned to speak of "a world of sin," but men and nations have had a new awakening to the import of that fact. And the hope of the world is not in the Church becoming worldly—not so can it "overcome the world"—but a spiritual ministry. Nothing can do the work of religion but religion. If ever the ideals and habits of people are to be spiritualized, it must be by spiritual means. Therefore, the supreme mission of the Church is spiritual. With that mission there ought to be ability and sufficient generosity to recognize the reality of religion in men whose lives are religious, though deterred by modesty or imposed ecclesiastical difficulty from acknowledging it. Dr. Henry C. King, President of Oberlin College, is credited with having said, "If we take the witness of the life against the witness of the lips when the witness of the

life is wrong and the witness of the lips is right, we ought to take the witness of the life against the witness of the lips when the witness of the life is right and the witness of the lips is wrong." This is but another way of saying that if we disregard a man's religious confession when he is living an irreligious life, we ought to disregard a man's failure of religious confession when he is living a positively religious life. Surely, much will have been gained when in the spirit of the age emphasis is placed on religious reality, as well as on the reality of religion.

A second characteristic of the life of today is a *spirit of service*. Our country was united in war work. There was a passion for service. All insisted on doing something. Aged men would knit, when with but a spark of life they could do nothing else. Children caught the enthusiasm and saved pennies for liberty bonds and war saving stamps. Canteens multiplied. The Red Cross reached out its hand of help everywhere. Our noble women responded to every need, giving of themselves, as fathers and brothers gave of themselves

without stint. We all were thinking of "our boys" in the war and of the imperiled cause of democracy. All felt the joy and saw the beauty of service. And therein was disclosed the glory of Jesus, who said, "I am among you as he that serveth."¹ A church that does not serve, that does not minister to the needs of the present age, will have no vital touch with its people, nor can it interpret the Christ to their understanding. The ministry of the Church must be to the whole-man: body, mind and spirit; and must look to the betterment of his environment and make secure his opportunities for self realization and improvement. Therefore, its effort will be not alone to save drunkards, paupers, and prostitutes, but as well to abolish institutions of infamy and the cruel conditions of living and of labor that produce a helpless and degenerate class.

Good things must be put in place of the bad. Such work in cities is on its way. The country has its needs. Fifty million people in the United States, one half of its

¹ Luke XXII. 27.

population, live in communities of less than 2,500 inhabitants.¹ Preventable diseases exact heavy toll in many country districts. Churches through reasonable coöperation with Red Cross workers could ultimately effect hygienic and sanitary conditions that would eliminate much suffering and largely reduce rural mortality.

The merciful work of Juvenile Courts, a county usually being the geographical unit of a Court, for dependent, neglected, and delinquent children, ought to be understood and helped by all who love the little child. And such work ought to be advocated and instituted in those States that have not yet undertaken it. The Juvenile Court laws of Maryland have been widely commended and drawn upon as ideal laws.

Live people demand an occasional good time. Here is opportunity for churches to provide recreation that is re-creation. The work can be started with a place for meeting and planned entertainment, placing as large responsibility as possible on various individuals. This is something practical for keeping young people from

¹ M. Katherine Bennett, *The Path of Labor*, p. 4.

questionable places, companionships, and amusements. Children should be similarly provided for. To this end why not utilize school-houses and school grounds?

There are many things that churches can do in community service, yet in the face of crying needs hundreds of country churches are doing little or nothing. "Son of man, can these bones live?" To be in harmony with the spirit of the present age, churches must preach the message and have the spirit of service.

As a third characteristic of the times, I would mention its high value of personal worth of character. The world honors its heroes. We bow in tribute before the graves of our American sons in our own home land, or where

"In Flanders fields the poppies grow
Between the crosses, row on row."

And our boys who have returned home, we would crown with the immortelles of gratitude and love.

There has gone out through all the land a new appreciation of character. Some of the boys may not be saints, but they have

their opinions of a people who profess one thing and do another. "The people of the world" have only contempt for a people who do the things which they ought not to do, and leave undone the things which they ought to do. That sort of thing brings disrepute on the Church. To again quote Mr. Bell, though "our boys" had the notion that they did rather like Christianity, "they were sure that they did not like Christians at all. Their feeling came to this in most cases—that, if Christian people would only endeavor to be Christians, the ordinary young fellow would like nothing better than to come along and try it with them; and that, if Christians wanted them to be interested, those Christians might well stop criticizing the Church and start criticizing themselves."¹

If any fact is plain, it is that emphasis in Christian teaching to-day must be on character rather than on ritual, on obedience to moral law rather than on confession of a creed. Not what a man professes or does not profess, but rather what a man is at heart, in "the purity of his private life, the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 404.

justice and generosity of his relations with his fellows, the quickness of his sympathies, the sincerity of his convictions, the integrity of his word and bond—this is the true test of religion.”¹ And this must be the reiterated message of the Church if it is to strengthen its hold upon the people of to-day who have learned to value men for what they *are*.

A fourth characteristic of the present age is a growing sense of brotherhood. We are awakening to the fact that as a people and as nations we are bound up together, “and whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it.”² There is “one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.”³ And God “hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.”⁴ Is it possible for one great spiritual kinship to bind together men and nations in the one great family? Is it possible to see in every crea-

¹ John Haynes Holmes, *Religion for To-day*, pp. 14–15.

² I Cor. XII. 26.

³ Eph. VI. 6.

⁴ Acts XVII. 26.

ture, whatever his race or language, an accredited child of this "one God and Father of all"? Unless the Church believes this, and works in the Spirit of it, then verily the end of things draweth nigh.

Men will differ and be different, with varying interests and varying ways of expressing what verily they believe. And those ways constantly affirm or deny that "one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren."¹ Other men feel as we feel, love as we love, hope as we hope, have aspirations, failures, sins, yearnings after God and the redeemed life, just like ourselves. If some do not, then greater should be our concern for "the one that is lost." The welcome of the members of a true church is to *all*, whom we hail as kin, brothers, and comrades. Such is the spirit that the Church must exemplify, if it would win the people of to-day, who have awakened to a growing sense of the bond of brotherhood.

A fifth characteristic of the present age is a deepening conviction of the necessity of justice. The very havoc wrought by in-

¹ Matt. XXIII. 8.

justice is making the world see with ever more clearness that justice *must* prevail or an orderly human society cannot endure. And this the Church must declare, must continually declare. In an atmosphere of justice the Great Menace cannot live.

One more characteristic which may be affirmed of the present age is a spirit of tolerance. Many things suggest otherwise. Intemperate speeches have been made on temperance. The "song of hate," first sung in Germany, has been heard in America. Protests of intolerance have greeted the effort toward unity of the Protestant Episcopal Church and other Protestant churches in America. Such phrases as "ecclesiastical Junkers," "spiritual bastards," "the heel of an Episcopal bishop," etc., are the amazing utterances that have been heard. I am not an Episcopalian, and, therefore, cannot be charged with prejudice when I say that the men who have used such language would find stinging rebuke in observing the spirit of the men who fought our war. Not of them was the song of hate; that is—or was—the song of the Hun. Not of them is

the calumny of one's own who happens to differ in the formal expression of what fundamentally we all believe. English soldiers repaired a shell torn German cemetery. On a cross in that cemetery the English soldiers lettered the words: "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us." A French officer said to Rev. Dr. Crane of Boston when in France on war work "Unless we are fighting for International spirit (brotherhood), let's quit." Cardinal Mercier of Belgium who remained by his suffering countrymen, sheltering, comforting and helping them, had reason, if any one had, for feelings of intolerance and hate. His simple narration of the things that were done under German occupancy, is an awful, damning indictment of German rule. He had seen his churches destroyed, the University of Louvain burned, his country ravaged, its people outraged, his priests shot; and he himself was imprisoned for days and threatened with death. Yet Cardinal Mercier, though bearing unspeakable sufferings with and for his people, said, "Whatever may be our

sufferings, we must not show hatred toward those who have inflicted them.”

A like chivalrous spirit is characteristic of our boys who passed through the fires of combat. It is not that they condone wrong. They hate, as do all of us, the atrocities, cruelties, and all things reprehensible practiced by the Germans and other enemy powers. Yet, our men who fought the hardest and suffered the most have returned with charity in their hearts and with no words of hate upon their lips. That fine virile example, as every standard of ethics known to man, confirms the principle that man has no right to harbor hatred toward any man, however great an offender. If people at large have not said this, they have felt this and have largely lived it. Expression of intolerance or spirit of hatred is *coup sur* sporadic.

When our country went to war, people at once began to work together and to pull together. As time went on the spirit of oneness in heart and purpose deepened. So too in the army and navy. Gentile and Jew, learned and unlearned, the rich and not-rich, were together in camp and trench.

Soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilians felt the bond of spiritual kinship,—we were Americans! Then, any mention of differences in creed or church was simply *unthinkable!* The religion of intolerance was dead, and *is dead now*. Some men are slow in taking this in, slow to respect others' opinions and ways; and are correspondingly free to hurl anathemas upon persons with whom they do not agree. What else can we expect when certain mountain and rural sections of our country are filled with "ministers" who cannot read, who do not travel, and who know little of the war or of the times, and whose conception of religion is the ism of an institution. How can such "ministers" influence returning soldiers who have been touched by a tolerant spirit, and who have had glimpses of the vital things of a spiritual religion? In parentheses, I would remark that the great need of the mountains and certain other rural sections is religious education. As for now, we will take heart because of the spirit of tolerance in the present age. We will hail one another as comrades and brothers, whose work is

one: for the kingdom of God; and whose hope is one in this "one God."

Such, I believe, are the great characteristics of the present age: first, its thinking in the terms of reality, and demanding, therefore, the vital realities of religion; second, a spirit of service, requiring for harmony therewith a ministering message and work; third, a high value of personal worth or character, calling for emphasis on "truth in the inward parts"; fourth, a growing sense of brotherhood, which spirit religious people—and people if decent—must exemplify; fifth, a deepening conviction of the necessity of justice, which we must continue to declare; and, sixth, a spirit of tolerance that has deepened into a bond of kinship, which opens the way for the Church to speak in like spirit to the very soul of the present age.



APPENDIX

A CITIZEN'S WORKING CREED


1. I believe in the Constitution of the United States; and pledge loyalty to it.

2. I believe in my country's flag and all that it symbolizes of home and love, freedom and patriotism, opportunity and fraternity, honor and justice; and will defend it as strongly as I can against enemies at home and abroad.


3. I believe in law and order; and will seek to effect social or economic changes, and promote the common welfare only in harmony with the orderly processes of law.

4. I believe in Government of, for and by the people; and will oppose the effort of labor, capital, or any other *class* for the domination of the people.

5. I believe in man's "unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness"; and I will firmly oppose all revolutionary movements such as Bolshevism, Syndicalism, I. W. W-ism or any other movement that would impair those rights or otherwise subvert the Constitution of the United States.











UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is **DUE** on the last date stamped below.

REC'D LIBRARY

QL APR 15 1991
MAR 27 1991

1250
6/20/2

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

A 000 125 318 6



Unive
So
L